

in the bill which has been introduced in the United States Senate providing for the erection of a monument memorial of the capture of the village of Montfaucon, suitable mention of recorded facts concerning the part played by the Thirty-seventh Division in such capture; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7252. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Knights of Pythias Relief and Employment Bureau, New York City, N. Y., favoring the establishment of a central police bureau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7253. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Edgar Braun and other citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring legislation extending aid to the people of the German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7254. Also, petition of members of the Political Service Club, of Erie County, urging the passage of the Townsend bill, which provides for a shorter hour for night employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7255. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, opposing recommendation of the Public Printer in regard to annual leave granted to employees in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

7256. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of the Mothers' Club of North Glenside, Pa., favoring restrictive immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 10, 1923.

(Legislative day of Monday, February 5, 1923.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gerry	McCormick	Ransdell
Bayard	Glass	McCumber	Reed, Pa.
Brookhart	Gooding	McKellar	Robinson
Bursum	Harrell	McKinley	Sheppard
Calder	Harris	McNary	Spencer
Cameron	Harrison	Moses	Stanfield
Capper	Heflin	Nelson	Stanley
Colt	Hitchcock	New	Sterling
Couzens	Johnson	Nicholson	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Townsend
Curtis	Kellogg	Oddie	Trammell
Dial	Keyes	Overman	Underwood
Dillingham	Ladd	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	La Follette	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
France	Lenroot	Polindexter	Warren
George	Lodge	Pomerene	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Commissioner of Patents for the calendar year 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

TRANSCONTINENTAL FREIGHT BUREAU.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 194, submitted by Mr. PITTMAN and agreed to December 15, 1921, a report of the results of its investigation of the organization, management, and control of the Transcontinental Freight Bureau, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

DEPARTMENTAL USE OF AUTOMOBILES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State furnishing, in response to the Senate's resolution of January 6, 1923, information concerning the passenger automobile in use by the Department of State.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 10, 1923.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to Senate amendment No. 33 to the bill

(H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, had agreed to the further conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MAGEE, Mr. WASON, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. LEE of Georgia were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 14254) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a commission authorized under certain conditions to refund or convert obligations of foreign governments held by the United States of America, and for other purposes," approved February 9, 1922, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. HENRY Z. OSBORNE, late a Representative from the State of California, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 10817. An act to amend section 100 of the Judicial Code of the United States; and

H. R. 13593. An act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. ROBINSON presented resolutions of the Farmers' National Farm Loan Association, of Fordyce, Ark., favoring the passage of the so-called Strong bill amending certain sections of the Federal farm loan act, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. KEYES presented resolutions of the congregation of the South Main Street Congregational Church, of Manchester; the executive committee of the Woman's Club of Hanover, of Hanover; and the Sunday School Superintendents' Association, of Manchester, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying an amendment of the Constitution regulating child labor, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented a resolution adopted by a general council meeting of the White Oak Point Bands of Chippewa Indians of the Mississippi, at Ball Club, Itasca County, Minn., favoring the passage of the so-called Larson bill, providing for a per capita distribution of funds in the Treasury to the credit of Chippewas for the relief of suffering and distress among said Indians, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution of the Killdeer National Farm Loan Association, of Killdeer, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of the so-called Strong bill amending certain sections of the Federal farm loan act, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WILLIS presented a resolution of the Ohio State Horticultural Society, favoring the passage of the so-called Purnell bill, for the financial assistance of agricultural experiment stations, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OWEN presented the following resolutions of the House of Representatives of Oklahoma, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, NINTH LEGISLATURE,
Oklahoma City, January 27, 1923.

Senator ROBERT L. OWEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR OWEN: Inclosed find copy of Engrossed House Resolution No. 16 which was passed by unanimous consent of the House of Representatives.

Very truly yours,

C. J. KENDLE, Chief Clerk.

Engrossed House Resolution No. 16 memorializing Congress to give its sympathetic consideration to a basic plan for a return to world sanity through a conference of world war powers under leadership of the United States.

Whereas it is made known by the American press that conditions in continental Europe grow daily worse; that nations, great and small, are tottering, unable to pay expenses; and

Whereas suffering among the people is increasing, famine threatens here and there, unemployment is growing, and a spirit of suicidal desperation has settled down over half the world; and

Whereas if step follows step and a new world war results this conflict by comparison will bleach the red horror of the last one, sweeping us along with the rest; and

Whereas the time to avert the European crisis is before it leads to a new conflict of nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Ninth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to give its sympathetic consideration to the following basic plan for a return to world sanity:

First. That the United States must assume the leadership;
 Second. That at the first possible opening President Harding should call a conference of the leading World War powers;
 Third. That the program at this conference should be in two sections, economic problems and limitation of armaments;
 Fourth. That instantly the conference is called to order America's spokesman should lay before the assembly some specific plan of world rehabilitation which might involve an international moratorium on war debts and an international loan to the worst stricken nations; and be it further
Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress.
 Adopted by the house of representatives this the 24th day of January, 1923.

CHAS. S. BRICE,

Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.

Mr. OWEN presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Oklahoma, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

SENATE CHAMBER, STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
 State Capitol, January 29, 1923.

HON. ROBERT L. OWEN,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I herewith inclose a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, with reference to the Orient Railroad. As you know, the western part of Oklahoma is very much interested in this railroad, and we want to ask you to use your best efforts to help save it.

Yours very truly,

IRA A. HILL,

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to grant aid to the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railroad.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring), That—

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Texas has memorialized the Congress of the United States to aid the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railroad; and

Whereas the said railroad traverses the western part of the State of Oklahoma; and

Whereas the abandonment and discontinuance of said railroad would work an equal hardship on the State of Oklahoma: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Ninth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That we join with the Legislature of the State of Texas in their memorial to the Congress of the United States in asking for their relief set forth in their memorial, which is as follows:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, by Bledsoe and Dudley.

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That the following memorial and petition to the Congress of the United States and prayer for relief from pending disaster and destruction of the Orient Railroad be adopted by the Thirty-eighth Legislature of the State of Texas and presented to the Congress of the United States and to the Interstate Commerce Commission; that—

"Whereas the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railroad, particularly that part of it built through Texas, is built through a pioneer section of the State susceptible of great development possibilities if given transportation facilities that must come through the proper maintenance and operation of said road, which aid and assistance can only come through the united action of our Federal Congress and the Interstate Commerce Commission permitting said road and the physical properties thereof to be taken over and operated under such conditions as will permit said road to continue as a factor for good in the development of that section of the State through which it has been constructed; and

"Whereas the necessity for such transportation facilities in the proper development of the pioneer section of our country has heretofore been recognized and encouraged both by Federal and State land grants; and

"Whereas said land grants can no longer be extended to any road because of the exhaustion of the public lands by such railroad grants; and

"Whereas a great injustice can be done to a patriotic citizenship by permitting the abandonment of said railroad and the discontinuance of its operation: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the plan heretofore submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States by the Hon. Lynch Davidson, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Texas, and embodied in this resolution as follows:

"Immunity from and relaxation of both Federal and State transportation laws are solvents to save the Orient railroad from abandonment, the scrap pile, and wreckage.

"That purpose is to be accomplished by Federal and State legislation. An act to be enacted by the Federal Government exempting any railroad owned, or of which a substantial part is owned, by a sovereign State or by the Nation from all transportation acts and laws other than the ordinary civil laws of the State and Nation.

"The classification of the Federal acts to provide that the title, or some substantial part of the title, of a road or roads enjoying such immunity shall be vested in a sovereign State or an agency created by a sovereign State.

"To further provide that any debt or obligation owing to the Federal Government by any road or roads so situated, whose rehabilitation and operation has been assumed by a State, shall be subordinated to all claims and moneys expended by said State in the rehabilitation or operation of such railroad.

"The measure to further provide that any net profits not essential to improvements, developments, and betterments shall apply 50 per cent to the payment of any sums due the State and 50 per cent to repayment of any sum advanced by the Federal Government.

"To further provide that such immunity, in the event of sale, transfer, or lease of a road to individuals or corporations, etc., shall continue for a period of 10 or 15 years following such transfer, lease, or conveyance, provided the State shall retain its control of said road and reserve the right to direct its affairs.

"The Federal act to require the State or States to furnish the necessary capital for rehabilitation and operation of the road to which it has taken title, and such requirements to constitute a substantial

guarantee of continuity of operation of such road or roads by the State or those holding under it.

"Repayment of all moneys due the State or Nation by a railroad under this classification shall be a condition of its relinquishment by the State.

"The Federal act to be effective only upon the enactment of corresponding legislation by a State or States."

"be submitted to the Congress of the United States with the request that suitable legislation be enacted carrying said plan into effect and directing the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States to make all suitable and necessary rules and regulations for the maintenance, operation, conduct, control, and management of said road in accordance with the terms of said plan; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the Oklahoma Legislature now in session and to the Kansas Legislature now in session; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this concurrent resolution be submitted to the Congress of the United States and copies presented to the Texas and Kansas Legislatures now in session."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6954) fixing rates of postage on certain kinds of printed matter, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1128) thereon.

Mr. ROBINSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1194) for the relief of Northrop Banks, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1129) thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (S. 4282) for the purchase of the statue "The Pilgrim Mother and Child of the Mayflower" and presentation of same to the Government of Great Britain, reported it without amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3023) for the relief of Robert F. Hamilton, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1131) thereon.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4156) authorizing the accounting officers of the General Accounting Office to settle the accounts of W. H. Power, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1132) thereon.

Mr. HARRISON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 1076) establishing standard grades of naval stores, preventing deception in transactions in naval stores, regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and submitted a report (No. 1133) thereon.

Mr. NICHOLSON, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 37) proposing to create a joint commission, to be known as the joint commission of gold and silver inquiry, which shall consist of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker, reported favorably thereon and moved that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, which was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 9, 1923, they presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 1016. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States";

S. 1878. An act to permit the State of Montana to exchange cut-over timberlands granted for educational purposes for other lands of like character and approximate value;

S. 1926. An act to extend the provisions of the act of February 8, 1887, as amended, to lands purchased for Indians;

S. 2023. An act defining the crop failure in the production of wheat, rye, or oats by those who borrowed money from the Government of the United States for the purchase of wheat, rye, or oats for seed, and for other purposes;

S. 3702. An act providing for the acquirement by the United States of privately owned lands situated within certain townships in the Lincoln National Forest, in the State of New Mexico, by exchanging therefor lands on the public domain also within such State;

S. 4169. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Aurora, Kane County, Ill., a municipal corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Fox River;

S. 4260. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge over the Columbia River, between the States of Oregon and Washington, at a point approximately 5 miles upstream from Dalles City, Wasco County, in the State of Oregon;

S. 4288. An act to grant the consent of Congress for the special commission constituted by an act of the Legislature of

Massachusetts to construct a bridge across the Merrimack River;

S. 4341. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Oregon-Washington Bridge Co. and its successors to construct a bridge across the Columbia River at or near the city of Hood River, Oreg.;

S. 4346. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Delaware State highway department to construct a bridge across the Nanticoke River;

S. 4353. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway commissioner of the town of Elgin, Kane County, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Fox River;

S. 4439. An act to revive and to reenact an act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Arkansas River between the cities of Little Rock and Argenta," approved October 6, 1917;

S. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of title to certain land within the Shasta National Forest, Calif.;

S. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution to provide for the payment of salaries to Senators appointed to fill vacancies, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution authorizing the President to abrogate the international agreement embodied in certain Executive orders relating to the Panama Canal.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 4523) to exempt from cancellation certain desert-land entries in Riverside County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4524) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Geiger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 4525) granting to the State of New Mexico certain lands; for reimbursement of the counties of Grant, Luna, Hidalgo, and Santa Fe for interest paid on railroad-aid bonds; and for the payment of the principal of railroad-aid bonds issued by the town of Silver City, and to reimburse said town for interest paid on said bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 14254. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a commission authorized under certain conditions to refund or convert obligations of foreign governments held by the United States of America, and for other purposes," approved February 9, 1922, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

WORLD WAR FOREIGN DEBT SETTLEMENT.

Mr. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 14254) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a commission authorized under certain conditions to refund or convert obligations of foreign governments held by the United States of America, and for other purposes," approved February 9, 1922, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOOR OF MEETING ON MONDAY NEXT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, if I can secure a unanimous-consent agreement to-day to adjourn until 11 o'clock on next Monday morning I shall not ask that the Senate take a recess to-night. So I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its business to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Washington that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been trying practically all of the week to hold a session. We tried it again this morning; but we could not secure the attendance of Senators, as the Senate met at 11 o'clock this morning. The hearing in the committee was therefore prevented. We have several bills before us, some of them being House bills, and some Members of the Senate are anxious to be heard. One of those desiring to be heard before the committee is the Secretary of Agriculture, who has asked for a hearing.

I have already called a meeting of the Agricultural Committee for 10.30 o'clock on Monday morning next in order to hear Members of the House of Representatives on certain bills which have passed the House and are pending here. If the

Senate meets at 11 o'clock, it means that committees will practically be unable to hold hearings or to dispose of any business. Senators will not attend a committee meeting for half an hour, because they know that nothing can be accomplished in that length of time.

Personally, when the Senate closes its business to-day, I do not care whether we shall then take an adjournment or a recess, but I should like to give the committees an opportunity to meet. I have this morning been told that four committees tried to secure a meeting to-day and that they all failed; that none of them was able to secure a quorum. The principal reason for that was that the Senate convened this morning at 11 o'clock, and Members knew in advance that they would simply lose the time if they should go to the committee meeting.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to say that I desire that the committees of the Senate shall meet and consider the legislation which has been referred to them by the Senate. The Committee on Commerce has been at work and has acted upon bills which have been referred to the committee. The session of Congress is nearing its close, however, and it seems to me there is very little possibility of any new business of importance which may be reported from committees, where the subject matter excites any division of opinion, being acted upon at this time. So I do not feel justified in preventing the Senate from meeting sufficiently early in the morning to act upon measures which have been reported to the Senate, in order that committees may consider matters as to which, while, of course, they are important and hearings should be held upon them, no one can hope to have action by the Senate during the present session.

Therefore, Mr. President, so far as I can, I shall insist upon the Senate meeting at 11 o'clock on Monday morning next, either following a recess or by adjournment. I submit the request for unanimous consent which I have made.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I dislike to object to the request which is now submitted by the Senator from Washington. Personally, I am not interested in the hearings which are now being held before our committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know the Senator is not, and I did not suggest anything of the kind.

Mr. NORRIS. I spent a half hour this morning in the committee room waiting for Senators to be present in order that there might be a hearing on the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from Idaho, but we were not able to secure a quorum. I feel in duty bound—and I have never failed to perform that duty—to call a meeting of the committee when any Member of the Senate asks to be heard or when any Member of the other House asks to be heard.

I feel that it is my duty always to comply with such requests. That means that, at least so far as I am concerned, my time is gone, and the time of one of my clerks is taken up, while awaiting the attendance of Senators. The hearings which are proposed to be held before the Agricultural Committee are not on bills which I myself have introduced but on bills which have been introduced by other Senators, and so long as Senators ask for a hearing thereon, it seems to me that they have that right, or at least that the chairman of the committee ought to do the best he can to secure a quorum of the committee and give them a hearing.

For that reason, Mr. President, not because of any desire of mine to object but because of the responsibility which rests on me to obtain a quorum of the committee if I can, much as I dislike to do so, I am compelled to object to the request for unanimous consent which is made by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, of course, I hope the Senator will not think anything that I have said is a criticism of his course, for I have not any criticism whatever to make of him.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not finding fault with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Nebraska is discharging his responsibility as he sees it and I am discharging mine as I see it. I desire to give notice that at the close of the session to-day I shall move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock on Monday, and I hope that Republican Senators will be present so that we may have the quorum necessary to take that action.

Mr. NORRIS. And I hope that those Senators who have been importuning me for hearings and who are anxious to be heard on the various bills, especially those which are pending before the committee of which I am chairman, may also be present at the time referred to by the Senator from Washington. I wish to give notice to those Senators that in making the objection I have done what I believe to be my duty, not in be-

half of myself but in their behalf. If they mean what they say, if they feel as though they wish to back me up in taking the position I have taken, I give notice to them that they ought to be here and vote against the proposition that at the close of business to-day the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator from Washington said that he would move to take a recess until 11 o'clock on Monday. I think it would be better if the Senator would move that when the Senate adjourns, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Possibly that would be better.

Mr. ASHURST. Monday being calendar day, I think we should have an adjournment instead of a recess.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yesterday, when I asked unanimous consent to take a recess until 11 o'clock to-day, I stated that if I could get unanimous consent I would be willing to adjourn until 11 o'clock Monday morning, and I am perfectly willing to move that when the Senate adjourns it adjourn until 11 o'clock Monday morning.

Mr. ASHURST. I think the Senator would be doing better to move to adjourn until 11 o'clock.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I say I am perfectly willing to do that when the time comes.

I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry. Is a motion that when the Senate adjourns to-day it shall adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on a day certain debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand it is debatable under the rule.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Under that decision, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to make a point of order because of the precedent that might be established. I make the point that it is not in order at this time to move that when the Senate adjourns it adjourn to a set date and hour. The only way to do that is by unanimous consent, and the only time to make the motion would be this afternoon, if it shall be desired to make it at that time, but it is premature to make it at this time, and it is not in order under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. There is no rule against it; the motion is in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have not looked the matter up, but I know it has been a very common practice in the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. Personally, I have no objection to meeting at 11 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. WARREN. I know of no rule which precludes the Senator from Washington making the motion which he has made. On the other hand, it has been done very frequently in the practice of the Senate during the course of many years.

Mr. HARRISON. My impression, so far as my short experience in the Senate is concerned, is that when the Senate meets at 11 o'clock it does so by unanimous consent. An order is made at the beginning of each session under the rules of the Senate fixing the hour of meeting at 12 o'clock. The rules can not be suspended except by a two-thirds vote, and in order to suspend the rules a day's notice is required, so that the hour of meeting can not be changed except by unanimous consent.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is mistaken about the motion being contrary to the rules, because a motion to adjourn to an hour certain is in order. The standing order of the Senate specifically states that the hour of meeting shall be 12 o'clock unless otherwise ordered, and the motion now pending proposes to order a different hour for meeting on next Monday.

Mr. HARRISON. I probably did not make myself plain to the Senator. I said that it might be in order this afternoon when we get ready to adjourn to adjourn to a definite hour on Monday. Then, if another motion should be made to adjourn to 12 o'clock, that would have priority, but at this time, when we are just beginning the day's proceedings, it seems to me that it is not in order to make the motion.

Mr. WARREN. It is immaterial to me, of course.

Mr. HARRISON. It is also immaterial to me.

Mr. WARREN. I am only making the statement now because I would not like to have it understood that a motion that when the Senate adjourns it shall adjourn to an hour certain is not in order at any time.

Mr. HARRISON. I submit that under the practice and under the rules the only way to do it is by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not exactly understand what the objection is which is made by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. The motion now is that when the Senate adjourns to-day it shall adjourn to 11 o'clock on Monday. Under the rules of the Senate 12 o'clock is the hour fixed for meeting; my point of order is that the only way to change it at this stage of the proceedings is by unanimous consent, and that has been the practice of the Senate. A request for unanimous consent was made, and objection was interposed to it. Now, the motion is made at this particular time when we are not ready to adjourn that when the Senate shall adjourn it shall adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday, and I submit that the motion at this time is not in order, and I have made a point of order to that effect.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator that I find nothing in the rules anywhere with reference to the hour of meeting. My recollection now is that an order is made at the beginning of each session that unless otherwise ordered the hour of meeting shall be 12 o'clock. I find nothing in the rules on the subject.

Mr. HARRISON. That may be true, but it was set as a precedent at the beginning of the session that the rule of the Senate would be to meet at 12 o'clock, as I understand, unless by other arrangement it should be changed. That is my recollection about it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Chair to the first volume of the Precedents, page 24, subdivision 6:

The Senate had under consideration the bill (S. 65) "to authorize the President of the United States to contract for the transportation of the mails, troops, seamen, munitions of war, Army and Navy supplies, and all other Government service, by railroad, from the Missouri River to San Francisco, in the State of California."

After numerous ineffectual attempts to postpone its further consideration and to adjourn, Mr. Johnson of Arkansas moved that when the Senate adjourn it be to Monday next.

The President (Mr. Stuart in the Chair) decided that this motion was not in order while another matter is pending.

From this decision Mr. Johnson of Arkansas appealed.

On the question, "Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?" it was determined in the affirmative.

Then the next precedent, under date of May 16, 1860, is—

The Senate resumed the consideration of the unfinished business, the resolutions submitted by Mr. Davis in relation to the questions of slavery and the rights of property in the Territories of the United States; and, pending debate,

Mr. Hale submitted a motion that when the Senate adjourn it be to meet to-morrow, at 2 o'clock, being made pending another subject; and the motion being objected to, as not in order,

The President (Mr. Foot in the chair) decided that the motion was in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What inference does the Senator draw from those two decisions?

Mr. LENROOT. I simply cite them. I would, however, call the attention of the Chair to a precedent that I can not turn to at this moment, but it is with reference to the adjournment sine die of Congress. Senators will remember that two years ago, I think, the question was up as to that motion being in order, that when the Senate do adjourn sine die it be on a certain date. I can not give the Chair a reference to the precedent, but I think the Senator from Mississippi very fully argued that question, and I think an appeal was taken, and the Senate decided that it was in order, as I recollect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The last decision seems to have been made in 1860. The Chair thought the difficulty with the motion would be the one that is decided in the decision of 1860, rather than the one raised by the Senator from Mississippi. The time of day that the Senate shall meet is not fixed by rule but by resolution. It is not a question of changing the rules, as the Chair understands; so the Chair is going to rule that the motion at the present time is in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Chair state the motion now, so that all Senators will understand it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday at 11 o'clock. On this motion the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. He is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MCKINLEY (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], which I transfer to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. STANLEY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST]. Being unable to secure a transfer, I withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DIAL. I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. Being unable to secure a transfer, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. KELLOGG. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE entered the Chamber and voted "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] having appeared and voted, I withdraw the transfer of my pair with that Senator, and being unable to secure a transfer I withdraw my vote.

Mr. JONES of Washington (after having voted in the affirmative). I understand that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has not voted. I have a pair with him for the day, which I find I can transfer to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLER]. I do so, and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bursum	Johnson	Ransdell
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Pa.
Cameron	Kellogg	Stanfield
Colt	Keyes	Sterling
Curtis	Lenroot	Townsend
Dillingham	Lodge	Warren
France	McCormick	Willis
Harrell	McKinley	

NAYS—26.

Ashurst	George	Ladd	Robinson
Bayard	Gerry	La Follette	Sheppard
Brookhart	Glass	McKellar	Trammell
Capper	Harris	McNary	Underwood
Couzens	Harrison	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Culberson	Heflin	Overman	
Fletcher	Hitchcock	Pomerene	

NOT VOTING—39.

Ball	Fernald	Norbeck	Spencer
Borah	Frelinghuysen	Owen	Stanley
Brandeggee	Gooding	Phipps	Sutherland
Broussard	Hale	Pittman	Swanson
Caraway	Jones, N. Mex.	Reed, Mo.	Wadsworth
Cummins	Kendrick	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	King	Shortridge	Watson
Edge	McCumber	Simmons	Weller
Elkins	McLean	Smith	Williams
Ernst	Myers	Smoot	

So the motion of Mr. JONES of Washington was agreed to.

POWER OF STATE LEGISLATURES OVER ELECTORAL COLLEGE.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to announce that on Thursday next, as soon after the convening of the Senate as I can get recognition, I shall address the Senate on the subject of the power of the State legislatures over the Electoral College.

JACOB F. ROSENBERGER.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Out of order I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Order of Business 1051, being the bill (H. R. 12887) granting a pension to Jacob F. Rosenberger. The bill, I am quite sure, can be disposed of without any debate at all. It merely corrects a clerical error in the omnibus pension bill of September 18, 1922. The clerk of the committee, I understand, put in the wrong first name for one of the claimants, and this bill merely corrects that error. I

will be compelled to be absent on Monday, or I would not ask for the consideration of the bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jacob F. Rosenberger, helpless and dependent son of Frederick Rosenberger, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month from the 18th day of September, 1922.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TARGET RANGE OF LINCOLN COUNTY, OKLA.

Mr. HARRELD. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6204) to grant the military target range of Lincoln County, Okla., to the city of Chandler, Okla., and reserving the right to use for military and aviation purposes. This is a bill which has been passed by the House and reported favorably from the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate. It will take but a moment to pass it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. With the understanding that it will not lead to discussion, I shall make no objection; but we are going to have a morning hour on Monday, and in the meantime I hope Senators will not call up any more bills from the calendar than are necessary.

Mr. ROBINSON. The report on the bill by the Committee on Military Affairs is unanimous.

Mr. JONES of Washington. As I said, if it does not give rise to debate, I shall not object to its consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole and it was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the title and fee to the military target range of Lincoln County, Okla., described in words and figures as follows, to wit: The south half of the south half of the northwest quarter of section 9, in township 14, north of range 4, east of the Indian meridian; except the land described as follows: Beginning at the southeast corner of said northwest quarter of section 9, running thence west 363 feet; thence north 445 feet; thence east 363 feet; thence south 445 feet to the place of beginning. Also, except the right of way of the Choctaw, Oklahoma & Western Railroad, now the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad, being a strip of land 100 feet in width across said land, extending 50 feet on each side of the center of the roadbed or main track of said railroad company. Also, except a strip of land 16 feet wide across the south line of the northwest quarter of said section 9, extending from the west line of the right of way of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad to the west line of the said northwest quarter of the said section 9, said tract so conveyed containing 34.48 acres, according to the survey thereof. And the south half of the south half of the northeast quarter of section 8, in township 14, north of range 4, east of the Indian meridian, containing 40 acres, according to the Government survey thereof. And the south half of the northwest quarter of section 8, in township 14, north of range 4, east of the Indian meridian, be, and the same is hereby, granted and conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., to be used as a public park, subject, however, to the right of the United States to at any time reenter and occupy the same for military purposes or as an aviation field; or the same may be used for said purposes by the militia of the State of Oklahoma under such terms and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War of the United States of America: *Provided, however*, That in the event the said lands are not used by the municipality for the purposes specified in this act the same shall revert to the United States: *And provided further*, That said lands shall be subject to the right of the United States at any and all times and in any manner to assume control of or use and occupy the same or any part thereof, without license, consent, or leave from said city or State for any and all military purposes, including use for a target range or aviation purposes, free from any conveyance, charges, incumbrances, or liens, made, created, permitted, or sanctioned thereon by said city or State.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition from representatives of commercial organizations, Commonwealths, and cities, assembled in convention in this city on February 7, urging that the pending bill be brought to a vote before the end of the present session of Congress. I ask that the petition, which is very brief, and the signatures of some 65 commercial bodies, be printed in 8-point type in the Record and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The petition, with the signatures, was ordered to be printed in the Record in 8-point type and to lie on the table, as follows: The honorable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned, representatives of commercial organizations, Commonwealths, and cities of the Nation, in convention assembled in Washington, D. C., this 7th day of February, 1923, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States

to pass speedily the pending legislation, with any necessary perfecting amendments, designed to establish permanently an adequate American merchant marine.

Failure on the part of this Congress to act promptly and constructively will in our judgment constitute an abandonment of our interests on the seas and will result in the disintegration of the great bulk of our present merchant fleet, because of the inability of our ships, unaided, to meet the competition of cheaper-built and cheaper-operated foreign tonnage. Without adequate shipping facilities under the American flag, not only our commercial prosperity, but the Nation's safety as well, will be endangered.

Delay in acting on the pending legislation will mean the surrender of an opportunity for the national welfare that may never return. We therefore urge, with the utmost earnestness, that the shipping bill be brought to a vote before the end of the present session of Congress.

National Merchant Marine Association, Jos. E. Ransdell, president; Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, per Robt. S. Alter, director; Middle West Merchant Marine Committee, by Malcolm Stewart, chairman; United States Ship Operators' Association, by Charles H. Potter, president; National Association of Manufacturers, 50 Church Street, New York, by Nathan B. Williams; Maj. Andrew W. Feuss, delegate; Washington Board of Trade, Washington, D. C., by Frank P. Leetch, delegate; Neptune Association of Masters and Mates (Inc.), John F. Milliken, secretary; Pacific American Steamship Association, per Edwin H. Duff and H. S. Scott; State of Maryland, W. H. Stayton, Wm. H. Matthias, and James E. Abbott, delegates; Geo. M. Shriver, per F. J. C.; American Manufacturers' Export Association, Myron W. Robinson, president; Galveston Commercial Association, by T. R. Hancock, director; New Orleans Association of Commerce, by William Allen, special representative; City of Tampa, Fla., by J. T. Lykes; Board of Harbor Commissioners, Wilmington, Del., Fredk. W. Hersey, operating division; C. A. McAllister, vice president American Bureau of Shipping; Memphis (Tenn.) Chamber of Commerce, S. H. Butler, president; Manufacturers and Jobbers' Association of the Columbus Chamber of Commerce, Avery G. Clinger, secretary; Muscatine Association of Commerce, C. E. Fox, secretary; Iowa State Chamber of Commerce, of Des Moines, Iowa, by Jos. F. Leopold; Gulf Shipping Conference (Inc.), S. O. Pedricky, president; South Atlantic States Association, Matthew Hale, president; American Steamship Owners' Association, by Winthrop L. Marvin, vice president and general manager; St. Joseph (Mo.) Chamber of Commerce, Harold S. Foster, secretary; Davenport Chamber of Commerce, C. R. Miles, secretary; Winona (Minn.) Association of Commerce, C. A. Bolton, secretary; the City of Philadelphia, by Emil P. Albrecht, delegate by appointment of Mayor J. Hampton Moore; the Philadelphia Bourse, by Emil P. Albrecht, president; Philadelphia Board of Trade, by Anthony S. Haydin, chairman foreign and coastwise commerce committee; Minneapolis (Minn.) Civic and Commerce Association, J. S. Cady, secretary; Kansas City (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce; Huron Commercial Club, Huron, S. Dak., J. Valentine, secretary; Lacrosse (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce; the St. Paul Association, Herman Mueller, traffic division; Fort Dodge (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce, R. O. Green, secretary; the Leavenworth (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, E. G. Blum, secretary-manager; New Orleans Board of Trade (Ltd.), Thomas V. Cunningham; special committee representing the city of Boston, J. W. Bruce, chairman, Lewis K. Thurlow; Illinois Chamber of Commerce, by John H. Camlin, president; Civic and Commerce Association of Superior, Wis., by W. H. Tyson, secretary; Chamber of Commerce, Mobile, Ala.; Manufacturers and Merchants' Association, St. Louis, Mo., Albert J. Davis; Lumberman's Club, Memphis, Tenn., J. H. Hines; Memphis Chamber of Commerce, J. H. Hines; Chicago Board of Trade, John V. Stream, president; Association

of Commerce, Madison, Wis., Don E. Mowry; Dubuque (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce, H. R. Hanger, acting secretary; Oklahoma Chamber of Commerce, T. C. Thatcher; Oklahoma Millers' Association, T. C. Thatcher; Oklahoma Grain Dealers' Association, T. C. Thatcher; Des Moines (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce, L. B. Jeffries; Chicago (Ill.) Association of Commerce, P. W. Kunning; Chicago World Trade Club, Chicago, Ill.; Institute of American Meat Packers, Chicago, Ill.; Topeka Flour Mills Co., Topeka, Kans., H. D. Yoder, vice president; Southwestern Millers' League Export Committee, Topeka, Kans., by H. D. Yoder, chairman; Millers' National Federation, Topeka, Kans., H. D. Yoder, director; Mobile (Ala.) Clearing House Association, Thos. M. Moore, secretary and manager; Fond du Lac Association of Commerce, Wis., E. T. Markle; the City Club of Decatur, Ill., Geo. A. Williams; Association of Commerce, Decatur, Ill., Geo. A. Williams; Chamber of Commerce, Evansville, Ind., J. S. Johnson, secretary; Chamber of Commerce, Huntington, W. Va., O. S. Frick, secretary; Toledo Chamber of Commerce, Toledo, Ohio, L. G. Macomber, traffic commissioner; St. Paul Association of Public and Business Affairs, St. Paul, Minn., J. A. Seegar, president; Milwaukee Association of Commerce, by M. A. W. Bably; H. W. Lawrie, representative Portland Chamber of Commerce, Portland, Ore.

Mr. FLETCHER addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I understood the Senator to state that Government ownership had never been given a fair trial. Is it not a fact that the Government lines which have been conducted by the Shipping Board have been a financial success? I would like to have the Senator tell us what he means by stating that it has not been given a fair trial, and whether or not, to the extent to which it has been given a fair trial, it has been a success.

Mr. FLETCHER. I shall be very glad to do that. Perhaps I ought to qualify what I said about the Government operation never having been given a chance by saying that in the instance of the Panama Steamship Line, where there has been Government operation all along from Panama—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. For how long?

Mr. FLETCHER. Some 20 years. They have made an abundant success. Out of the whole 20 years they have had a deficit in only two years, and those deficits amounted to a very small sum when we consider all the circumstances surrounding them. For instance, last year the deficit has been stated to be \$587,000. If we allowed them credit at commercial rates for the supplies and employees carried down there for the Government, their deficit would not amount to \$125,000. In other words, they have been carrying supplies and employees to Panama at much less than commercial rates have been all along.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And, of course, last year overseas freight cargoes reached the bottom as to rates.

Mr. FLETCHER. Oh, undoubtedly. Even the Shipping Board put the Government-owned ships in competition with the Government's own line.

Mr. CALDER. But did they do that in the case of the Panama Steamship Co.?

Mr. FLETCHER. Oh, yes. The routes and service covered by the Panama Steamship Co. were also covered by the Shipping Board.

Mr. CALDER. Direct to Panama?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Shipping Board ships, I think, operated touching possibly at Porto Rico and Haiti, and perhaps some ports along the West Indies to Panama, and were in the same service.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Panama line did not touch those ports?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; it went direct to Panama. I do not think the service by the other company was direct to Panama, but was the same service the Panama line had been engaged in.

Mr. CALDER. If the Senator will permit me, for a number of years the Panama Steamship Co. operated its ships direct to Panama and did not stop at those outlying West Indies ports, but a few years ago, under Secretary of War Baker, it was determined to have the vessels stop at the West Indies ports. Now the shipping interests of the country have con-

tended that the Government-owned vessels were actually put in competition with privately owned vessels on those routes run by private lines before, and that they have almost completely destroyed the opportunity for private lines to operate to the West Indies.

Mr. FLETCHER. I presume the Senator's statement is correct, and I expect he is better informed than I am on the subject. I did not mean to offer any criticism with reference to using Shipping Board vessels in that service as against the Panama line. I think the Shipping Board vessels were operated by private operators and not by the Government itself in that service. It is possible that some years ago the service was direct between Panama and New York. I do not know just when it was broadened to take in the other ports.

Mr. CALDER. I think it was about three years ago. I know at the time that representatives of shipping companies in New York and some from the Gulf States came to see me here, and I went with them and protested to the Secretary of War against the operation of the Government-owned ships competing with privately owned lines which had been operating the lines to the West Indies for years, and that they were being destroyed because of Government operation. I tried to induce Secretary Baker to give an opportunity to those people to continue their business rather than have it destroyed by the Government.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. If it is true that Government shipping destroyed them, is not that a pretty strong argument for the efficiency of Government operation?

Mr. CALDER. If the Senator from Florida will permit me to answer the inquiry of the Senator from Iowa, of course the Government can operate in competition with private companies where the Government has no insurance to pay, where the Government does not figure any interest on capital expenditure, and very often does not figure depreciation. Let me say to the Senator that the Government can not operate vessels in competition with privately owned lines if they do not have those extraordinary expenses to pay, as the private operator has.

Mr. BROOKHART. If they do not have them to pay, that means there is greater efficiency in Government operation.

Mr. CALDER. From my investigation of the subject, I quite disagree with the Senator. From every investigation I have made and every inquiry I have been able to make, it is just like the matter of the operation of the railroads by the Government during the war. When we got through with that operation we discovered that we had worked out a deficit of \$1,800,000,000. We could go on paying such deficits, of course, but it would be unwise to do so.

Mr. BROOKHART. Let me call the attention of the Senator to another fact which he forgets, and that is that the first year after the roads were turned back to private ownership, which would be the best year for comparison with Government operation, the operating expenses increased about \$1,485,000,000 under private operation. Does the Senator consider that fact? The people have to pay all that money.

Mr. CALDER. It cost us nearly \$2,000,000,000 to operate the railroad lines under Government operation.

Mr. BROOKHART. Even if that were true, of course all of it was expense that private sources took from the railroads when they were not entitled to do it. One trouble with American business is that they are all the time shouting about better government, all the time saying to the Government, "You are inefficient, you can not do anything, you had better turn everything over to us." I think their attitude toward the Government of the United States is the most unpatriotic attitude in the country. Instead of trying to help the Government be efficient, they take the unpatriotic position that they want to get all these things themselves and do not want the Government to perform its real functions.

Mr. CALDER. Of course, we are getting far afield from the shipping business, but I want to say to the Senator that I utterly disagree with him on the question of Government operation of utilities like railroads and steamship lines. I am quite convinced that in the matter of the operation of Government-owned steamship lines there is just one thing or the other for us to do if we hope to maintain an American merchant marine, either through the Government saying to private shipowners to go ahead in that direction, or else, as the Senator apparently proposes, let the Government operate the vessels itself. There are just those two lines of thought.

Mr. BROOKHART. When it reaches the stage that we must take Government money out of the Treasury so it will make millionaires out of private shipowners, then I protest that as a matter of principle the Government, under those conditions, ought to operate the ships.

Mr. CALDER. That is the Senator's opinion, but my judgment, after a wide study of the subject, convinces me that Government aid and private operation can be worked out with much less expense to the Government and much more efficient operation.

Mr. BROOKHART. I do not like the Senator's line of argument. When I am talking about my Government and saying my Government is the best institution in the world, I do not like to be met with the argument that the Government is inefficient and that it can not do these things. If the Government is inefficient, it is the fault of the Senate and the House and the President and the officials who are running it, and that fault ought to be corrected so the Government could do its duty in that matter as well as in other matters.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. I would like to finish the answer to the Senator's first question about Government operation. The other instance of Government operation is the United States Lines.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I was going to ask about that line.

Mr. FLETCHER. That has only begun comparatively recently. It has been of short duration. They had to take over a bankrupt concern that undertook to buy the ships and could not carry out the contract. They collected money ahead of time on passenger fares when they never could carry out their contracts with the passengers. The Government took over one line and, not having any private operator available and not having been offered a MO-4 contract, they had to take the ships, and so they put Mr. Rosbottom in charge of the line. That is the only other instance, and that has been a success.

Mr. MCKELLAR. One of the lines has made considerable money, has it not?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The other, running to London or to Southampton, is not paying so well, but they are more than breaking even, taking them together.

Mr. FLETCHER. They are doing splendidly wherever the boats are adapted to the service. There are some ex-German 25-year-old tubs, as Mr. Rosbottom called them, that ought not to be in the service at all. They could not be operated profitably by anybody. They might be used on the Pacific in certain kinds of service over there, and with profit. I do not mean that they ought to be given away or scrapped. They are not worthless, but they are not suited for the Atlantic service, and consequently they are losing money. Outside of that the line is a great success.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. As I understand it, the Government has pursued two policies in reference to Government-owned ships. It has maintained lines of its own, ships owned and operated by the Government. The other policy is one of loaning ships to private interests and making contracts with those private interests for the operation of them. Under the bookkeeping system of the Shipping Board, is it not a fact that the bookkeeping of the Shipping Board showed a profit in the activities of the Government operating its own ships and a substantially great loss in the operation of loaning ships to private interests and making contracts for their operation?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that is quite true.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. So that, so far as the financial statement of the Shipping Board goes, the more profitable operation for the Government has been of the two experiments operating ships under Government operation?

Mr. FLETCHER. Unquestionably.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And the great financial losses that have come have been as a result of the MO-4 contracts, which are contracts entered into with private concerns to operate Government-owned vessels.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes. I think the Senator states that correctly.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator this question: Is it not true that the confused policy of the Shipping Board is hurting the operation of its ships very greatly? In order to make myself clear, I desire to say that I understand the Shipping Board is very anxious to put all the ships into private hands, and as soon as practicable to sell them, if possible; and, if not, otherwise to get rid of them. If the Government were to pursue a policy of making our shipping a success and, say for a period of years, establish the policy of building up our shipping, under those circumstances would it not, in the Senator's opinion, cut down the losses very greatly, if not remove them entirely?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think undoubtedly that would be so. I have tried to state during the course of my remarks here to-

day that where they are handling the ships on the basis of liquidating the business they can not expect to succeed. It is entirely different from operating the ships as a going concern.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, they have put themselves in the position of a receiver for a private corporation who is winding up the corporation?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. And it is not intended to build up the business, to make it a paying business, but the purpose under those circumstances is simply to get as much cash out of it as possible and then to quit?

Mr. FLETCHER. And to hold out to the world the idea that it is a temporary emergency concern.

Mr. McKELLAR. That it is a temporary emergency concern which is going to be put out of business at the earliest moment possible?

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under those circumstances, I desire to ask, did the Senator from Florida ever know any business to make a success?

Mr. FLETCHER. It would be impossible. I think the Shipping Board has done remarkably well under those conditions in establishing what routes they have established and in the amount of business they have done.

Mr. McKELLAR. To my mind that is the cause of the trouble that the Shipping Board is now in. If they would go out and get business in order to build up a permanent and successful merchant marine for our country, instead of showing a \$50,000,000 a year loss they would show an enormous profit in the business.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me just there?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CALDER. I think the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the response of the Senator from Florida are substantially correct. I think it is undoubtedly true that such operation of a shipping company, like the operation of any other business with the intention of liquidating the business rather than making it a going concern ultimately to be operated at a profit, undoubtedly tends to destroy the effectiveness of the organization. Undoubtedly that is true. We should have done much better if we had gone ahead on the theory that the business was to be a Government-owned and Government-operated business of running ships overseas.

Mr. McKELLAR. At least until we had made it a success and could in a proper way turn the business over to private interests.

Mr. CALDER. If the Senator from Florida will permit me a little further, I desire to say that from my investigation of the subject—and coming from New York City, I have opportunities of inquiring into these matters—I know that it is true that in nearly every case overseas voyages made by the vessels which are operated by private lines under contract with the Shipping Board result in a loss to the Government. I know of instances where the operation of vessels to various ports in Europe by shipping companies results in losses of \$2,000, \$3,000, \$4,000, and even \$10,000 a voyage to the Government.

I have in mind the statement made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] in connection with the United States Line. I have taken the trouble to have some of their figures analyzed, and I shall print in the RECORD, at the end of the remarks of the Senator from Florida, if he has no objection to my asking permission now, the statement, which has been worked out by some gentlemen who are shipping men and who know the circumstances. They tell me when one comes to consider the maintenance and repairs for the vessels of the United States Line, the really genuinely operated Government line, that the aggregate losses will run into the neighborhood of \$500,000 a month; in other words, the loss to the Government in the operation of the United States Line for the past year will total nearly \$6,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator take any other lines into consideration except the lines which are running from New York to Plymouth and from New York to Bremen?

Mr. CALDER. I am considering the operation of the vessels which are under control of the line referred to.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, those are the two lines of which Mr. Rosbottom has charge, and they are run purely as Government lines. As I understand, the line which runs to Bremen is a success and made last year a profit of something like \$700,000, and while the other line, running to Plymouth,

has not paid, the losses do not amount to as much as the profits which were made on the route to Bremen.

Mr. CALDER. The gentlemen whom I have in mind point out that on some of the round trips of the United States Line vessels the losses to the Government total as high as \$40,000.

I submit, Mr. President, that we are not going to continue that sort of business forever. We are going to do one of three things: Give Government aid; establish the policy of Government operation and pay the losses out of the Treasury; or, as the Senator from Utah said the other day, put the ships up on the auction block, sell those which we can sell, and those which we can not sell take out in the ocean and sink.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Government can not make the business a success, with no insurance, as was said awhile ago, and with no interest on capital, and with other carrying charges less than a private individual could possibly have, does the Senator think that an individual could make it a success? How does the Senator figure that out?

Mr. CALDER. I think with Government aid such as is proposed to be provided in the pending bill it may be done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, of course, if we make the aid large enough; but if we ever start the aid, as we know from having previously given aid in other instances, whenever a particular interest gets its hands into the Public Treasury it puts them down deeper and deeper and deeper and gets more and more as the years pass by.

Mr. CALDER. I do not think so. I think when it gets to the point where the American people will feel the burden is too great, and that satisfactory results are not being obtained, the whole thing will be abandoned; just as I believe—if the Senator from Florida will permit me to interrupt him further—that if we go on as we have in the last year or two under Government operation, we will proceed for a while with losses aggregating \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 a year, as the case may be, and some day, in view of the spirit of economy and the demand for a decrease in the cost of government and the lowering of taxes, we will sell the ships, as the Senator from Utah has suggested, on the auction block, to whomsoever wants to buy them, and go back to the condition we were in in the days before the war, when Europe had over 90 per cent of our carrying trade.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, the Senator does not think that America will ever be able to build up her merchant marine?

Mr. CALDER. I do not think it will ever be possible for America to build up her merchant marine in competition with nations abroad which can build ships and operate them cheaper than Americans can.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, how can the Senator get his consent to vote for a subsidy if the payment will never be of any lasting benefit or good to the American people?

Mr. CALDER. I will say to the Senator that I do not believe it is possible for us to maintain a privately operated merchant marine in competition with Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, France, Germany, England, and other nations without sufficient Government aid to make up the difference in operating our ships as compared with the operating costs of European ships. If it is against the policy of the Government to give that sort of aid, then we might as well abandon the whole thing, and go back to the pre-war arrangement.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand the Senator, he says that even if we started the subsidy plan and expended \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 a year at first, and even if we increased it later, he does not think even then we could make it a success?

Mr. CALDER. The Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understood the Senator to say that we would soon go back to pre-war conditions.

Mr. CALDER. Oh, no; but I am fearful when we start out giving the subsidy that some day the American people may become tired of contributing money in that direction. I admit to the Senator that it is a pretty serious matter; the taking of money out of the Public Treasury and giving it to private interests to operate a business directly for their benefit as well as for the benefit of the country is a question as to which men may honestly differ; but it seems to me that shipping is a little different from anything else; it is a splendid auxiliary for our Navy, a second line of defense, as it were, and a good means to bring about the expansion of our business abroad. I think that the farmers of Iowa and of Tennessee and of all the other sections in the interior of the country away from the seacoast will be directly benefited by having a merchant fleet carrying their products all over the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. I, too, think so; I believe in building up the merchant marine; and I think that the Government should

aid in every way in securing business for our merchant marine, in securing cargoes for American vessels; but the Senator knows that wherever any fleet of ships, say, those of the Standard Oil Co. or of the United Fruit Co. or of the United States Steel Co. or of any other business corporation, have cargoes both ways they make money. They do not need any subsidy. What the Government ought to do, in my judgment, is to make the conditions as favorable to our getting cargoes as it is possible. I differ from the Senator about the future of our merchant marine. I believe if the Government would secure favorable conditions under which our ships could get cargoes to carry our products abroad and to bring foreign products to our shores we would have as prosperous a merchant marine as any other nation, and probably more so, because we have more business.

Mr. CALDER. We have our commercial attachés throughout the world, and I think, perhaps, they are doing some good for us; but we will, it seems to me, never get all of the foreign trade which we ought to get until we have a merchant marine of our own.

Now, let me say to the Senator it was my privilege to talk at length to a gentleman who represented our Shipping Board in Buenos Aires for several years and until very recently. He told me when he went there he found our Shipping Board interests in the hands of a European—I forget whether the agent was a German, a Dutchman, or of some other nationality—but he found no real sympathy there on the part of the men acting for our Shipping Board in our business. He said we have not thought in terms of shipping. In the very recent past people from the Argentine and Brazil went to Europe in order to reach the United States, and naturally traded in Europe; we were not getting all the trade we could in those countries; whereas if we had had our ship lines running up and down the east and west coast of South America and to the principal ports of the world we would increase our business.

I do not question the Senator's desire to do the best thing for his country; I am sure he means to do the best thing; but I am confident that if he agreed to my theory of the shipping business he would support my position, as I would support his position if I believed in his theory. However, I am convinced from my observation, from long residence in New York and long experience with shipping interests, and from intimate first-hand knowledge, that we will not be able to operate a fleet of vessels in competition with European nations unless we give Government aid to them; otherwise we will, as the Senator's argument seems to indicate he favors, be compelled to resort to Government operation of the vessels.

Under Government operation, let me say to the Senator, American private competition is driven out; the operation of American vessels is then put entirely in the hands of the Government. Is the Senator for that? Does he believe that to be the best policy for the future merchant marine in this country? If he does, then the question is merely one of Government operation as against private operation. The lines are then directly drawn.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say to the Senator I am inclined to believe that if we imposed a discriminating duty of 5 per cent upon the goods brought to our shores in American bottoms and required, of course, that goods which are on the free list should be brought in in American bottoms, that would give us the business. The Senator knows that there are a number of old treaties, one of them made in 1815, more than a hundred years ago, that greatly discriminate against American trade and commerce and that have discriminated against them ever since they were made; but for some unimaginable reason they have been allowed to remain as they are by the inaction of our executive department. I say let us abrogate those treaties and put in a discriminating duty, and then all American ships, private and public, would get all the business that they could do and make a great success of it.

Mr. CALDER. In response to that statement let me say to the Senator that with the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], in charge of this bill, and several other Senators I helped prepare the so-called Jones Shipping Act of 1920. We provided in that bill substantially the very thing the Senator suggests. I recall that the Senator from Florida was quite enthusiastic about how that would work out. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that I fully concur with him; if we had been able to put the discriminating-duty provision into effect, it would have had a splendid effect and might have solved the problem. I am inclined to believe that it would have solved it; and if that had been done I do not think we would be here to-day.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would have been better than any subsidy, would it not?

Mr. CALDER. But, as the Senator knows, a Democratic President did not agree with that. He did not agree with it when it was incorporated in the Underwood Tariff Act. I did not vote for that tariff act, but I did vote for that particular provision in it. It was a splendid thing, and I thought it would be helpful to our merchant marine; and then it was incorporated in the Jones law.

Neither President Wilson nor our present President was willing to put it into effect, however. One of the things our present President is enthusiastic about and exceedingly anxious to see, one of the great things he has always urged, is the development of a merchant marine; but, for some reason, both President Wilson and President Harding were fearful that our treaties would be violated if we attempted to put that provision into effect. I think that would solve the problem. I should like to see it done.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit me just a moment, the Senator knows that Congress itself has the right to annul and abrogate these commercial treaties. We did it in the case with Russia and in other instances. We have the right to do it. I have already prepared and offered an amendment to this bill to abrogate those treaties, and if that is done there is no reason in the world why we can not put the discriminating duty in force; and I want to ask the Senator this question: With the treaties abrogated, and the discriminating duty in force, does not the Senator believe it would be very much better than any cash payment?

Mr. CALDER. I am not certain of that; but it might be, and I am willing to try it if it can be put into effect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will vote for the amendment that I shall offer in order to try it.

Mr. CALDER. Will the Senator permit me to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter analyzing the cost of operating the United States Lines?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield for that purpose. Of course, it will follow my remarks, and not appear as a part of my remarks—

Mr. CALDER. Certainly; it will follow the Senator's remarks.

Mr. FLETCHER. Because I differ with the Senator's view, and I have no doubt with his correspondent's view, about the estimates as to these losses; and I have already put in the RECORD some data furnished by Mr. Manson and Mr. Rosbottom showing the contrary—that those lines have been successful.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

The Journal of Commerce of January 10 contains a statement by Mr. T. H. Rosbottom, general manager of the United States Lines, in which he claims that in the statement from which Mr. Lasker derived his figures the United States Lines was compelled to carry a financial burden which a privately owned company would not be called upon to bear in its operating account. This statement leaves the erroneous impression that the United States Lines' losses are largely paper losses and that Government operation is efficient and likely to prove profitable for the Government. That such is not the case should not require demonstration. If it did require demonstration, the list of voyage losses sustained by the United States Lines' vessels should make a complete refutation. However, as the United States Lines form the best presently known example of Government operation an examination into their accounts is pertinent.

The period I shall cover will be from July 1 to December 1 of 1922. This is the most favorable period of earnings that could be taken. On July 1 new immigration quotas are opened up. In August, September, and October the spring tourist trade eastbound is returning home. The three critical months in the passenger business, namely, January, February, and March, are excluded:

The net profit of the United States Lines for the month of July was \$61,809.43.

The net loss of the United States Lines for the month of August was \$187,707.79.

The net loss of the United States Lines for the month of September was \$124,031.24.

The net loss of the United States Lines for the month of October was \$74,276.17.

The net loss of the United States Lines for the month of November was \$436,004.83.

The net loss of the United States Lines for a period of five months was \$760,210.60.

Mr. Rosbottom objects to the financial burden of reconditioning ships. Let us examine these costs—

Maintenance and repairs for July	\$55,339.50
Maintenance and repairs for August	283,479.78
Maintenance and repairs for September	218,228.39
Maintenance and repairs for October	95,233.82
Maintenance and repairs for November	297,465.14

Total 949,746.63

This \$949,000 is not merely a book transfer, it is money that has been actually paid out by the Government. How it would relieve the situation to charge this amount to a capital account I am unable to understand. However, advocates of Government ownership seem to object to taking it into account. As a matter of fact, it is excessive.

Under prudent operation and following normal commercial practice maintenance and repairs for this fleet would probably cost in the neighborhood of \$450,000.

But raising the question of a capital account works both ways. The fact that the United States Lines' accounts do not include capital charges is the reason that they are able to make any showing whatsoever. The fleet of ships under control of the United States Lines costs the Government between \$70,000,000 and \$100,000,000. These ships are conservatively worth \$17,000,000. Insurance, depreciation, interest, and other capital charges would certainly amount to 2 per cent a month. This would mean an additional loss of \$340,000 per month, or for the period of five months an additional loss of \$1,700,000 if a capital account were considered.

An examination of these figures shows that the Government in operating United States Lines is sustaining a loss of between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000 a year. Even assuming that \$1,000,000 is extraordinary and unnecessary, the figures are still startling. In one operation alone the Government is losing about one-sixth of the total amount of the subsidy asked for, and these losses are not confined to one line alone. Scarcely a ship is sailing for the Shipping Board to-day that is showing a profit. I know that every month ships are sailing for the account of the Shipping Board showing losses ranging from \$2,000 to \$40,000 a voyage. This is not the fault of the Shipping Board. They have done a stupendous task in reducing the losses to what they are. The fault lies in the fact that the Government can not succeed in so personal a business as is shipping. Furthermore, as I have clearly shown before, operating costs under the American flag and the extraordinary expenses incident to the development of a pioneer industry are too great for private enterprise to overcome.

There is only one alternative if the merchant marine is to survive. Government aid in some form must be given. The method provided in the ship subsidy bill is the most businesslike and workable plan that can be devised.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question.

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator spoke of the benefits of ship subsidy to the farmers of Iowa and of the United States generally. At present, according to the letter from Mr. Lasker, under Government operation of these ships the rates on grain are perhaps about 40 per cent less than they were before the war. That is a direct benefit to the farmers, and grain is the biggest of our export cargoes. What advantage can there be to the farmers of Iowa and the rest of the United States if we turn this matter over to private companies, who will fix the rates then without regulation of the Government, and they will surely be raised, and the farmers will pay them? They always pay the freight, whether coming or going. They pay it both ways. There is no way for them to add it in. Now I will ask the Senator if that will not destroy the benefit we are getting out of the Government operation of these ships right now?

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to answer that question—

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CALDER. The farmers are getting low freight rates on their grain to-day not because of Government-operated vessels or Government-owned vessels of the United States Shipping Board or anything else but because of the competition in carrying overseas tonnage of every character. There is a dearth of cargo for the amount of space available, and, of course, the freight rates are down, and that will happen whether the vessels are operated by the Government or by private concerns; it does not make a bit of difference.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Government is a real competitor. It competes. It is not afraid to compete; but as soon as we turn over these ships to private parties there is nothing in the world to prevent them from making a combination that will end the competition. That is what usually happens with the financiers of New York.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the financiers of New York are just as patriotic as the splendid people the Senator represents. They are interested in getting the best they can for what they have to sell, just like the farmers of the West, upon whom we of the East depend so much, and who, I agree with the Senator, are more in need of help than the financiers of the East; but the Senator evidently has not informed himself upon the practice of dealing in freight charges for oversea tonnage, because if he had he would know that it has been the practice for decades that whenever there is a dearth of tonnage the freight rates come down.

Our own Shipping Board has sat in conferences and agreed upon rates for its shipping, just the same as private people have; but to-day, because of the need of freights, the rates have been cut, and the farmer is getting the advantage. I am glad he is, because he needs it; and while the Senator lives nearer the farmer than I do, because I live in a big city, I want to tell him that anything that will help his farmer I will join with him in getting, because I think the farmer belongs to the one class of producers in America that needs help, is entitled to help, and ought to have it more than any other.

Mr. BROOKHART. But the thing that will help the farmer will be to continue this Government operation, and, if a deficit

occurs, levy a tax on these high percentages of earnings to pay the deficit.

Mr. CALDER. That is just a difference of opinion between the Senator and myself. I am against Government operation of steamship lines. He is for it. That is our division of thought, and I doubt if we ever can get together on it.

Mr. FLETCHER resumed and concluded his speech, which, entire, is as follows:

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I desire to refer to some of the arguments offered yesterday by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. JONES of Washington], and to certain impressions which seem to have gone forth regarding the pending bill and the attitude of Senators with reference to it, and to consider generally the whole subject. The statement is made in the press, and the idea seemed to be somewhat emphasized by the address of the President to Congress on the 7th of this month, that those opposed to the pending bill have been employing obstructive tactics, wasting time, and indulging in what is commonly called a filibuster in an effort to prevent a vote being taken on the bill. I do not feel called upon to consider the circumstances in which a filibuster would be justified in either branch of Congress or to discuss the merit or demerit of such practice as the occasion may call for, but I refer to it simply by way of getting at the truth and stating the facts with regard to what the Senate has been doing in connection with the legislation which it has been considering.

It will be recalled that the President called an extraordinary session of Congress last year for the purpose of having the ship subsidy bill considered. The object was to secure the passage of that legislation at the extraordinary session. No obstructive tactics were employed on this side of the Chamber in connection with that movement. It was found that there was no strong support of the measure in either branch of Congress, at least not sufficiently strong to warrant an attempt to press the measure to a vote, and it was finally decided that hearings should be had, and after that that Members of Congress would better return to their homes and get the views of their constituents. When they came back, they were no more impressed with the importance of passing such legislation than they had been before, and in fact, less so. The reaction of the constituency in each case seems to have been just the other way, and if we can judge from the election, whatever bearing that question had on the issues the country is opposed to this kind of legislation. In the recent election, the result of all inquiry and submission of the question to the people, wherever it has been presented and considered, has been to confirm the old-established policy of the country against subsidy.

During this session of Congress there has been no marked delay in the consideration of this bill. The chairman of the committee, always frank, candid, and fair, yesterday stated expressly that the appropriation bills had been put through the Senate with a speed unprecedented. If there had been in operation in the Senate any filibuster against the pending bill, it would have been perfectly easy to pursue dilatory tactics in connection with every appropriation bill presented, but, as a matter of fact, as the chairman of the committee has said, every appropriation bill has been passed without delay, and with only such inquiry and discussion and debate as were necessary to inform the Senate of the contents of such bills.

The pending bill has been laid aside by the chairman in pursuance of a program which, with or without his consent, was agreed upon on the other side. I believe he said on yesterday that he did not quite agree, but that his will was overcome by others, and it was determined that the ship subsidy bill should be laid aside and the appropriation bills taken up and considered as they came forward. For nearly a month that has been the procedure, not by any design or as the result of any effort on the part of those who oppose the bill, but in pursuance of a program approved and fixed on the other side of the chamber, where the bill is being supported.

As the result of that, the bill has not thus far had the consideration and the discussion to which its importance entitles it. My idea is that it should be fully and freely discussed and considered here upon its merits, and whether any filibuster may develop hereafter or not remains to be seen, and I take it that when it does develop, if it does, it will be of such sort and in such shape as to be fully recognized.

The impression has been created that the fact that the bill has not been considered and kept constantly before the Senate is the result of efforts on the part of the opponents of the bill, which is not true at all. That impression was emphasized by the address of the President delivered to the Congress on the 7th of this month. The President used this language:

I am unwilling—the public is unwilling—to continue these appalling losses to the Public Treasury when we know we are operating with no prospect of relief or of ultimate achievement. Congress owes to itself, to the executive branch of the Government, and to the American public some decisive action. Mere avoidance by prolonged debate is a mark of impotence on a vitally important public question.

Those are quite significant words, and the question naturally arises, what has given the occasion to the President for this lecture of the Congress or either branch of the Congress? Has it been shown that those who oppose the bill have indulged in such tactics as to warrant the observation that it is demonstrating impotency on the part of Congress to act?

In the first place, I have always questioned, and I think with full justification, the claim about the appalling losses arising from the operation of the ships. I have pointed out on numerous occasions that there is no Government operation of the ships except in the case of one line that is of recent establishment, the United States Line, in charge of Mr. Rosbottom, and except in the case of the Panama Steamship Co., which has been in charge of the Government, of course, from the beginning and long before we ever had ships built by the Government. Those are the only two instances of Government operation.

What is called Government operation by the Shipping Board has been in pursuance of what we know as the MO-4 contract, whereby private operators have charge of the Government ships, under which arrangement the Government stands all the losses, and pays a commission of 5 per cent on the gross amount of business done. That contract was denounced by Mr. Lasker in July, 1921, as vicious and inexcusable, and as constituting a means for raiding the Treasury, and yet it is continued up to this minute. Although he has been in charge since that time and he found the contract thoroughly indefensible as he did, yet he has continued it up to the present time.

That has been called Government operation. Of course it is not Government operation at all. It is the handling of Government-owned ships by private operators where the Government stands all the losses and the private operator makes a commission on the business no matter what it is.

In addition to that the private operator is allowed what is called a husbanding fee, a fee in addition to the commission allowed him as a sort of bonus or contribution toward covering his expenses for the care of the ship, and that is paid by the Government. Under this plan there is no approach to Government operation. It has not any of the essential features of Government operation except the Government furnishes the ships. It is a kind of operation that must mean utter failure, no matter by what agency or power or authority it is undertaken, so far as the Government is concerned. Any individual using his property in that way would suffer loss inevitably and could not make a success in the way of establishing the business which he was undertaking to establish.

The whole trouble has been that the Shipping Board never has meant seriously to undertake to operate the ships as a Government enterprise. The whole plan and idea and thought has been to conduct the business as a liquidating process, not as a going concern. There is no chance of success where the aim and effort has been not to succeed. But that does not mean that there can be no such thing as successful Government operation of merchant ships in overseas trade. It has never had a trial by the Shipping Board except when they were driven to attempt it in the one instance of the United States Line and that succeeded beyond and contrary to their expectations as I shall show.

I have questioned the alleged excessive losses even under those circumstances and conditions. The figures of the total expenditures of the Shipping Board last year show they amounted to \$30,046,584. How can it be said that they lost \$50,000,000 operating the ships? The testimony before the joint committee of the House and Senate on this very bill showed that the losses then figured and established by their books and the records, as testified to by their witnesses, amounted to less than \$3,000,000 a month. Their own statement in the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill just recently passed shows that the losses have been less than \$3,000,000 a month. Why keep proclaiming here over and over again and reiterating, and having the President adopt it—and, of course, the President is dependent upon these gentlemen for his information—that the loss is \$50,000,000 a year? That may have been the case under the MO-4 contract at a time when they were sailing three times as many ships as now. The board claims to have effected many economies since then and reduced the losses. So that these losses, great as they are and inexcusable as they are in my judgment, do not approach the figures which have been given to the President and which the President designates as appalling.

The President might have in mind when he goes to scold Congress or either branch of it, what the Congress has done and called on him to do by express enactment, which he has refused

to do. Because his views on this subject do not seem to be readily accepted here he is scarcely warranted, I think, in holding up to the country the idea of impotency on the part of either branch of Congress or lecturing either branch of Congress because of its inaction or prolonged debate. It must be remembered that Congress has heretofore expressed its conclusions and adopted a policy with reference to the proper way of establishing an American merchant marine.

In 1920, after a thorough study of the whole subject and after some considerable experience extending over a period of at least four years, Congress reached a very definite conclusion about the policy to be adopted by the country looking to the establishment and maintenance of an American merchant marine and wrote it into the law. This policy was announced as contained in section 34 of the act of June 5, 1920, page 60, as follows:

That in the judgment of Congress articles or provisions in treaties or conventions to which the United States is a party which restrict the right of the United States to impose discriminating customs duties on imports entering the United States in foreign vessels and in vessels of the United States, and which also restrict the right of the United States to impose discriminatory tonnage dues on foreign vessels and on vessels of the United States entering the United States should be terminated, and the President is hereby authorized and directed within 90 days after this act becomes law to give notice to the several governments, respectively, parties to such treaties or conventions that so much thereof as imposes any such restriction on the United States will terminate on the expiration of such periods as may be required for the giving of such notice by the provisions of such treaties or conventions.

The chairman of the committee, pressing this bill, yesterday frankly admitted that if this policy had been carried into effect, if this law had been executed, if we had only put into force the policy adopted by Congress in 1920, it would have accomplished far more in the way of establishing and maintaining an American merchant marine than the most ardent friends of the pending measure could hope for under it if it should become a law.

Now, Congress has, not only with the approval of the present President, who was then in the Senate and indorsed this action, but with the approval of the then President of the United States, enacted a law declaring the policy, declaring the principles upon which an American merchant marine must be built, which not only authorized but directed the President to do the things set forth in section 34.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Is the Senator advised why President Wilson did not execute the similar provisions contained in the tariff act of 1913, enacted at a time when his own party was in power?

Mr. FLETCHER. The courts held the act of 1913 was in violation of treaties and conventions, and therefore could not be enforced. As to the act of 1920, I only know, Mr. President, that one of the grounds assigned was that it was not considered advisable or advantageous in any way for the country to undertake to terminate the conventions as therein provided. For certain economic reasons, on account of certain conditions as to the world situation, and so forth, it was thought to be an unwise policy to proceed to put into effect the law or to do the things specified in the act of 1920. Then there was, as I recall, another argument and there may be something in it—it is worth considering in this connection—that here are certain contracts, commercial agreements, conventions, or treaties, or whatever we may call them. We are parties to them. The other countries, respectively, are parties to those contracts.

The general rule of contracts, as the Senator knows, is that neither party may modify a contract by striking out certain clauses in it, either taking from or adding to the language expressed and agreed upon in the original contract, without the consent of the other party. If a party to a contract should undertake to do that, and the other party does not agree, the only thing which may be done is to end the whole contract and make a new one. The language of the act is:

To such treaties or conventions, that so much thereof as imposes any such restriction on the United States will terminate on the expiration of such periods.

I am inclined to believe that we were a little unfortunate in using language indicating a purpose to denounce only portions of those treaties, so much of the treaties as interfered with our free liberty and right to impose discriminating duties. What we should have done in the act of 1920 was not to undertake to denounce certain portions of the treaties but to denounce the treaties in their entirety according to their terms; for I very much question whether the party to a contract may select certain portions of it and say that as to those portions it shall not

be longer binding. The truth is that the requirement should have been that each one of the treaties should be denounced according to its terms in toto and new treaties entered upon. At any rate, without going into the reasons why that was not done, it was not done in the previous administration and it has not been done in this administration, and I think for the same reasons that prompted and that were given in the last administration; but, for some cause or other, it has not thus far been considered advisable to denounce those treaties. It may be that it would impose a great deal of hard work upon the State Department to enter upon new negotiations and to contract new treaties; but suppose it should do that, suppose it should involve a considerable amount of effort and work on the part of the State Department. These old treaties are out of date and are obsolete anyway, their terms provide how and when they may be terminated, and we should not be violating any of them by adopting the course provided for and expressly set forth in the treaties in denouncing them. Either party to them, respectively, has that right by their very terms.

What I am claiming now is that the President, while refusing and declining absolutely to execute a mandate of Congress, undertakes to lecture Congress because it indulges in debate on a measure which he proposes; in other words, he says in his address:

I am trying to emphasize a responsibility which can not be met by one branch of the Government alone. There is call for congressional expression, not mere avoidance. I am not seeking now to influence the Senate's decision, but I am appealing for some decision.

He says that Congress ought to go along with him, but he is unwilling to go along with Congress. Here is a law authorizing and directing the President to do certain things. The President refuses to do those things. The law lays down a definite, clear, expressed policy which Congress feels ought to be pursued with reference to this whole question, but the President says, "I do not agree with you about that." He then goes further and in effect says, "This is not a matter for the Executive alone, but it is a matter for both legislative and executive branches of the Government to take hold of, and you must do as I say in connection with it. I am unwilling to do what you decide is the proper thing to do; I refuse to do it; but you must cooperate with me by doing what I want; and if you do not cooperate with me, I will take you to task about it; I will call you 'impotent'; I will say you are indulging in obstructive tactics; I will say that you are unreasonably wasting time in handling these great public questions; in other words, 'you must go along with me as I go, but I am unwilling to go with you in the direction which you determine is the right road to travel.'" I merely mention that in connection with the position which seems to be emphasized by the President's observation.

I also call attention to his further remark, which is quite serious either in the way of a notice or a threat. In any case, it is quite significant when the President says:

Then, if Congress fails in providing the requested alternative measure, the executive branch of the Government may proceed as best it can to end the losses in liquidation and humiliation.

Does that mean that if the pending bill shall not be passed, then the President is to give orders to the Shipping Board, and the Shipping Board shall immediately tie up all the ships, abandon all the routes and discontinue all the services, and absolutely and entirely cease all kinds of operation? Is that what we are to understand by that observation?

Again, we are confronted with what Congress thought was the wisest thing to do. It is true that in the act of 1920 the policy announced at the beginning of the act is stated in this language:

That it is necessary for the national defense and for the proper growth of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine of the best equipped and most suitable types of vessels sufficient to carry the greater portion of its commerce and serve as a naval or military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency.

I quite agree with that. There is no use to argue with anybody, it seems to me, on that proposition. There is no use publishing articles in the newspapers and taking up a lot of time trying to impress that upon the country. But I think we were unfortunate in the act of 1920—I did not think so at the time, for I did not think it would be construed as it apparently is about to be construed—when we used this expression:

Ultimately to be owned and operated privately by citizens of the United States.

To-day I would strike that language out; I would not promise that the Government was to retire wholly from the ownership and operation of merchant ships. Even if I expected that to be

done I would not say so. The effect of that language has been to give the excuse to the Shipping Board for a half-hearted make-believe Government operation; the effect of that has been to enable them to claim justification for pretended, temporary, soon to be discontinued, Government operation, which has been a liquidating process, as I have said, and not operation as a going concern. How could they expect ever to build up the business when they announced to the world, "in a short time we expect to be entirely out of it, and we are only doing this now as a temporary measure because we have got the ships on our hands and we do not know what else to do with them except to operate some of them; but we do not seriously mean to make a business of operating ships; we are doing this simply as something we can not avoid doing for a short period, but expect and intend to get out of in a very short time?"

The result has been, of course, that the whole process has been unsatisfactory and the whole undertaking has fallen down, largely by reason of the lack of effort to make it a serious work and to make a success of operating ships. Even then we used the word "ultimately"—not now, not at once, not immediately, but ultimately we expected that these ships would pass into private hands. The act continues:

And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to do whatever may be necessary to develop and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine; and, in so far as may not be inconsistent with the express provisions of this act, the United States Shipping Board shall, in the disposition of vessels and shipping property as hereinafter provided, in the making of rules and regulations, and in the administration of the shipping laws, keep always in view this purpose and object as the primary end to be attained.

In addition to that, in paragraph 4, on page 2, the act provides:

The board shall have full power and authority to complete or conclude any construction work begun in accordance with the provisions of such acts or parts of acts if, in the opinion of the board, the completion or conclusion thereof is for the best interests of the United States.

We gave the board power to go on and complete ships, showing that we did not intend at once to abandon all Government ownership or control or operation.

Then, in reference to the sale of vessels, we provided:

SEC. 5. That, in order to accomplish the declared purpose of this act and to carry out the policy declared in section 1 hereof, the board is authorized and directed to sell as soon as practicable—

Not now; not at once, necessarily—

consistent with good business methods and the objects and purposes to be attained by this act, at public or private competitive sale, after appraisal and due advertisement—

And so forth.

Further on in the same section it is provided:

The board in fixing or accepting the sale price of such vessels shall take into consideration the prevailing domestic and foreign market price of the available supply of, and the demand for vessels; existing freight rates and prospects of their maintenance; the cost of constructing vessels of similar type under prevailing conditions, as well as the cost of the construction or purchase price of the vessels to be sold; and any other facts or conditions that would influence a prudent, solvent business man in the sale of similar vessels or property which he is not forced to sell.

That is the policy, that is the principle upon which we have instructed the Shipping Board to proceed; yet, if I can read between the lines here, the President indicates very clearly that it has been apparently the policy of the Shipping Board all along, and is now their purpose, to cease Government operation entirely, tie up the ships, abandon the routes, and give up the services in which they have been heretofore employed if Congress does not pass this bill.

That would be a clear violation of the law which we have laid down. If this bill fails, and does not pass, the previous acts of Congress are not thereby repealed. The alternative is, "Live up to the laws which are before you, and which you have been required to execute and ordered to execute; carry out the policies heretofore adopted by Congress." That is the thing to do if we refuse to do something else. They are not without statutory authority and power. Congress has expressed itself, determined this whole question, put it into the law, and directed the President to execute the law.

The responsibility is on him. He refuses to carry out a mandate of Congress, and now he proposes to disregard what has been set forth in the legislation where we said we expected the ships ultimately to pass to private ownership, but in the meantime we would not part with them except under conditions that would influence a prudent, solvent business man in the sale of similar vessels or property which he is not forced to sell.

We said further, in section 7:

That the board is authorized and directed to investigate and determine as promptly as possible after the enactment of this act and from time to time thereafter what steamship lines should be established

and put in operation from ports in the United States or any Territory, district, or possession thereof to such world and domestic markets as in its judgment are desirable for the promotion, development, expansion, and maintenance of the foreign and coastwise trade of the United States and an adequate postal service, and to determine the type, size, speed, and other requirements of the vessels to be employed upon such lines and the frequency and regularity of their sailings, with a view to furnishing adequate, regular, certain, and permanent service. The board is authorized to sell, and if a satisfactory sale can not be made, to charter such of the vessels referred to in section 4 of this act or otherwise acquired by the board, as will meet these requirements to responsible persons who are citizens of the United States who agree to establish and maintain such lines upon such terms of payment and other conditions as the board may deem just and necessary to secure and maintain the service desired; and if any such steamship line is deemed desirable and necessary, and if no such citizen can be secured to supply such service by the purchase or charter of vessels on terms satisfactory to the board, the board shall operate vessels on such line until the business is developed so that such vessels may be sold on satisfactory terms and the service maintained, or unless it shall appear within a reasonable time that such line can not be made self-sustaining.

Then on down in other clauses of the same section, we said:

Provided further, That where steamship lines and regular service have been established and are being maintained by ships of the board at the time of the enactment of this act, such lines and service shall be maintained by the board until, in the opinion of the board, the maintenance thereof is unbusinesslike and against the public interests: *And provided further*, That whenever the board shall determine, as provided in this act, that trade conditions warrant the establishment of a service or additional service under Government administration where a service is already being given by persons, citizens of the United States, the rates and charges for such Government service shall not be less than the cost thereof, including a proper interest and depreciation charge on the value of Government vessels and equipment employed therein.

So that, from the language here, the scope and purpose of the act, as expressing the intention of Congress, was that the board should carefully investigate and ascertain the routes and services that needed attention and, if they could not charter the ships to operate on all routes, to put in the Shipping Board ships and operate those routes themselves. Of course, that was not to continue indefinitely if it was an absolutely losing business. I grant that; but two years is a comparatively short time in the life of a great undertaking. This act was passed in June, 1920. Undoubtedly some of these ships have rendered valuable service and with a considerable profit to the Government. All of them are not total failures; not all of them are creating these colossal losses that are talked about. There is ample time yet to determine what the Government will do with reference to these ships. There has not been any sincere, bona fide effort at Government operation up to this time. There has been no test with reference to that.

I say that the law of 1920, the previous legislation, all that the Congress has done in connection with this merchant marine are wholly inconsistent with any purpose to abandon immediately the routes and services and tie up these ships; and if the president of the Shipping Board pursues that course, it will be done in defiance of Congress and in the teeth of the mandate of the legislative branch of this Government.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator—

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator's position is this: The Congress of the United States adopted a specific plan for the development of its merchant marine. The President was charged with the execution of that plan, and, among other things, was directed to serve notice upon the other nations that we preferred to do away with the conventions which provided for reciprocity; and, notwithstanding the fact that that plan was approved by President Wilson when he approved the bill, nothing has been done toward carrying out those provisions, either by President Wilson or by President Harding. In other words, the policy of the Congress of the United States in that behalf has been ignored. Is that right?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely. The language was—

And the President is hereby authorized and directed within 90 days after this act becomes law to give notice—

And so forth. It has been ignored, frankly, upon the ground, apparently, that they did not consider it advisable to carry out that law. What I am saying is said with the utmost respect to the President and in all good will; but I am simply mentioning this in response to his scolding, if we may call it that, of the Senate for what he calls delay in action upon this bill and evidence of impotency, when he ought to remember that Congress has expressed in law its policy on the subject, and he, as the Executive, has refused absolutely to carry it out.

I had reached the point of dealing with this subject of Government operation, and I want to dwell somewhat further on that point. I have stated that there never has been any effort made to operate the ships by the Government successfully.

Going back beyond the present board, it seemed to be assumed that the Government should not compete with, but only do the things that would help, private owners.

I have recently had some correspondence with a gentleman who is well informed and thoroughly posted on this subject in general, and as to some specific matters in particular, Mr. Nelson Collins, and he has furnished me a very interesting statement covering the history of what he calls "The Government civilian fleet."

I have his permission to make use of these facts, which I consider pertinent, as showing what the Government can do and one reason why it is able to boast of having done so little:

What came to be called in maritime circles "the New York office" was the branch of the Shipping Board that actually ran all the ships—165 of them at the maximum—that the Government held in one great civilian fleet throughout the war. There were many ships operated by private companies—the Army Transport Service also ran ships with civilian crews throughout the war—but this was the separate governmental civilian undertaking. While other offices in Washington and New York and Philadelphia devised policy, or built ships, or assigned cargoes and routes, or tabulated statistics, or investigated and investigated and investigated, this was the office charged with getting the ships in and out of port, storing them, manning them, repairing them, keeping them at sea as much as possible and at piers as little as possible. A hundred and sixty-five ships and 8,000 seagoing men was what the term "the New York office" came to mean in the clipped speech of the shipping world, with a perfected arrangement of piers and offices and repair yards and manning headquarters ashore.

Capt. Charles Yates was the head of the organization, Capt. E. P. McCauley the marine superintendent, Walter Scott the supervising engineer, W. H. J. Reynolds the commissary superintendent. They operated nearer to the normal civilian basis than anybody else; than even the private companies, dominated and interfered with as the private companies were throughout the war by numerous governmental war agencies.

The ships of "the New York office" were on the runs to France and England and Italy and Russia; went coastwise to Atlantic South America and through the Panama Canal to Pacific South America; ran down to Cuba and Porto Rico, carried coal from Newport News to New England. Its ships carried 20 per cent of all the supplies taken to Europe under the United States flag for both our own armies and our allies. The office devised and executed its own repair system for both the incidental voyage repairs and the semiannual general overhaul. It had its own legal bureau. It maintained a system of guarding its ships in port, under W. H. Moore, that kept its great fleet throughout the war without a single serious fire or theft. Its commissary operated in 1918 at 86 cents per man per day with satisfied crews and a variety and value in its food that led to many inquiries from private companies. It handled its own manning problems and its shipping office at No. 5 Greenwich Street, under John J. Daly, never failed to keep the ships supplied with crews, in regular routine or emergency call. This shipping office was used as the basis of the Government's shipping-office system when the Shipping Board reorganized its operations in a peace-time program. It established a complete system of medical inspection and treatment under Dr. W. H. Meiners.

"The New York office" got started early in April of 1917. Captain Yates came over to New York from Washington with only a slip of paper that certified his authority from the Shipping Board. He at once organized the protection and the overhaul of the interned German liners until the Navy was in shape to take them over. Within a week Captain Yates let \$7,000,000 of verbal repair contracts on the German ships, the great dockyards proceeding upon his simple assurance that the Government would, as time permitted, put the engagements he made into formal instruments. Weeks were thus saved in getting the great German liners to sea.

The first three ex-German ships were repaired, manned with civilian officers and crews, and at loading berth for cargo one month after the declaration of war, and before Congress passed the resolution authorizing the President to take over the ships and operate them. The *Clara Mennig*, renamed the *Yadkin*, was the first ship got to sea. She was out within three weeks. The first ship to make a European port was the *Maia*, in command of Capt. Louis Lefevre. Captain Lefevre was shortly after transferred to command the *Artemis*, a big ship and a fast one, and in her he added to his record of getting the first Shipping Board ship to a foreign port, the bigger record of making the fastest turn arounds, and the greatest number of them in the fleet throughout the war.

But this necessary offhand and verbal method of handling the ex-German ships at the outset immediately gave way to careful and economical organization. The Atlantic fleet of "the New York office" started with six ships only and a dead-weight—that means, roughly, cargo-carrying—tonnage of 28,828 in May of 1917. A year later, when the United States was swinging into the fullness of its war effort, the fleet was 128 ships, with a dead-weight tonnage of 810,562. It was the greatest fleet of merchant ships that ever has been gathered into one operating unit under the United States flag. Besides these that the office actually operated thirty-odd more were in its possession at times for repair or for a single voyage. An idea of the operating problem is afforded by the fact that the fleet in May of 1918 was twice the number of ships that it had been three months before, in February. As a matter of crews and supplies and repair yards and office force, that increase is a strain on an organization. In March of 1918 there were 88 ships, and the next month, April, there were 122, which meant more than a ship a day during the entire month assimilated by the Government's operating office for manning and running. Back in May, 1917, the second month of us in the war, the ships under the New York office steamed 6,963 miles, all of it to Europe, for there was no time as yet for ships to be headed home again. In May of the next year, 1918, the ships under the New York office steamed 345,244 miles.

The record for actual war service of this fleet will stand at approximately 3,000,000 ship miles, 200,000,000 ship-ton days (the number of days a single ton of shipping might be imagined as sailing the seas), and 20,000,000 ship-ton miles (the number of times a ton of cargo-carrying shipping went a mile). It employed 8,000 civilian ship officers and men at sea. It standardized the commis-

sary of ships, it solved important manning problems and labor relations and it systematized repairs.

It lost 13 ships, 8 destroyed by submarines, 1 destroyed by internal explosion of its TNT cargo, 2 sunk in collisions, and 2 lost in storms.

The way the work progressed is typically expressed in a telegraphic report to Washington July 14, 1917, three months and a week after the state of war was declared:

"Summary work New York office close of this week as follows: 17 ocean-going ships and 4 harbor craft now in full commission. Fourteen ocean-going ships to be commissioned during month August. Three ocean-going ships to be commissioned after August. Sixteen large passenger-ships with repairs from 5 to 90 per cent complete chartered to Navy Department as transports. Four ocean-going ships loaned Panama Railway Steamship Co. Seven ex-Austrian ships not yet purchased by Government. Total, 65 ships, over 500,000 gross tons, or approximately 750,000 tons dead weight."

The one advantage that the New York office had then and inescapably would have had in a peace-time existence over any private shipping corporation was the prestige of the Government for financial and operating accommodations, particularly in foreign ports. That is bound to attach to it, but again the advantage is more apparent than real, for the financial prestige of any successful office handling so many ships is quite sufficient for all purposes and carries with it the operating accommodations and courtesies, such few as may from time to time be exacted in relations with jealous foreign competitors.

Nothing can be conceived in which the Government fleet was not on all fours with the private companies, the bigger of them. Aside from routing and stevedoring everything had to be done by the particular office that had the ships assigned to it, and in the case of the New York office it meant a hundred and fifty ships. The scaling of ship's boilers is a good illustration. This is a dirty job that has to be done each voyage with each ship, and the office had to keep its force of men competent and willing for such a task in a state of constant efficiency.

The ships went on all the routes, the great trunk thoroughfares of the liners and the little poking side trips of the tramps. They sailed constantly from New York or Newport News or Baltimore or Philadelphia or Halifax. Sometimes a new ship—just finding herself in stress of seas—came around from Seattle or San Francisco.

The greatest service of the New York office was in fighting the fight for civilian life in merchant ships throughout the war, in keeping the pride of the civilian system alive for growth in times of peace by showing that it did not break down in morale and organization in time of war. How much that was needed is shown by the care of countries greater at sea than we are to keep the civilian aspects of life in their merchant marine intact throughout the war, and how it might have failed is shown by the ease with which such a problem was ignored by every other agency of Government or private shipping. The New York office by its size and equally by its effectiveness was the center of the whole civilian maritime system. Here also, of necessity, was the only great experiment in Government ownership and operation of ships. The New York office, by the very fact that it became willy-nilly a great example, was under all kinds of experienced technical observation. Some were hopeful of its success, many were hopeful of its failure.

I want to say right here, Mr. President, in answer to a suggestion made by the Senator from Washington yesterday to the effect that those who oppose this bill are speaking the language of British shipping, that nothing would bring greater joy to British shipping and to our other competitors on the high seas than for the United States Government to cease to own and operate merchant ships. There is no question about that. If the United States lines now operating across the Atlantic were turned over to private enterprise, if those ships were sold to individuals, and they undertook to operate them in that service, it is within the power of the British and our other competitors on the high seas to put the entire line out of business within 30 days, and I have no question but that they would do it. They would proceed to do that now if it were not for the fact that the United States Government owns those ships and is behind the operation of that line. That is the only thing that saves us at all. There is no doubt, in my judgment, that if this bill passes—though I do not believe it will—within a few years, possibly 10 years, after subsidies have been paid for that length of time, the American flag will disappear from the seas so far as foreign commerce is concerned, and we will find ourselves just where we were in 1914. The only way to make certain that American ships, owned by Americans, flying the American flag, and serving American commerce, shall be continued, and that that flag shall wave from port to port around the world as the tallman of a world commerce, is for the United States to own and operate a sufficient number of ships to secure protection to our commerce through just and reasonable rates and the service which our people need in their overseas trade. There is no doubt at all but that Great Britain would like to see this shipping bill fail, provided the President proceeds, as he indicates in his message he may do, to tie up all the ships we own and cease to operate a single ship in a single service or over a single route already established.

That is exactly what Great Britain would like to have done; but if this bill is not passed, if the Shipping Board will proceed as we authorized them in the act of 1920, which is still in force and never has been repealed, to operate those ships where they are needed, where they can serve our commerce, tie them up where they incur losses of a serious character, and wait for the time when they can be put out into the trade profitably, but hold them and not give them away and pay somebody to take

them—if they will pursue that policy and continue to operate the United States Lines, because it is a profit-making line, as I propose to show, so as to serve our overseas trade and build up and develop our markets, it will be the saddest day and the day of the greatest apprehension and disappointment that ever came to British shipping. That is a thing they do not want. They do not care anything about the subsidy. They do not care anything about any other process that looks to liquidating these ships. They want us to liquidate. What they dread and what our competitors everywhere dread is the assurance that this Government proposes to own and operate merchant ships in sufficient quantity to serve our trade.

I do not mean that I advocate the Government taking over all shipping from individuals, or to discourage private enterprise. On the contrary, the very policy which I have outlined, if put into effect, would encourage private enterprise, would help individuals to build ships and develop trade and privately owned shipping. The Government would merely supplement what is needed and take care of our people in reference to foreign markets and overseas trade.

Mr. Collins further says:

Every month of increasing effectiveness in operation seemed to make Captain Yates, its managing head, less confident of permanence for the great organization he was welding. "It is safe for a reasonable length of time, if it is mediocre," was his intimate reply to any congratulations. "Real success will give it too many enemies." Reared in the Coast and Geodetic Survey Bureau at Washington, he knew the red-tape dangers of any Washington overlordship upon the office. "I dread the bureaucrats more than I do the American Steamship Owners' Association," he used to say when objection of shipping corporations to it as a growing example of Government operation was repeated to him. His whole policy was to make the New York office the autonomous center of Government ship operation, responsible to Washington, the division of operations of the Shipping Board there, for results, but not for day-by-day procedure.

A great seaport not a great national capital was the right seat for full and final practical operating authority. At Washington the concern was and could profitably only be with ship construction and with general questions of administration, the relations of the Shipping Board with the President, with the two Houses of Congress, with foreign shipping, with the War Department and the Navy Department, with the contacts that any governmental department must maintain throughout the country. Washington was the natural seat of nearly all such activities, though as a matter of fact Mr. Schwab finally secured the transfer of shipbuilding headquarters offices from Washington to Philadelphia, because the greatest shipbuilding plant, Hog Island, was there and along the Delaware also were the greatest private shipbuilding plants of the country. By the same sound reasoning the management and operation of ships needed headquarters at New York, the chief port of the country, and management and operation in other ports of the country, in Philadelphia, Boston, Savannah, Newport News, New Orleans—everything on the Atlantic and the Gulf or that came around to these ports from the Pacific coast and from the Great Lakes—needed to be in relation to New York first of all and in relation to Washington only secondly through New York. For more than a year this autonomy of the operating office was maintained. It was the principle of Captain Yates's entire administration of the office. But the bureaucrats he feared and the private shipping men in the Washington offices saw alike in this matter. The general accounting office of the Shipping Board in Washington insisted upon including the New York office accounts in its general mess of financial records, and so the orderly financial showing of voyage by voyage was lost. The next vitiation came when Washington decided along in the summer of 1918 that all other ports should be shorn from New York, and instead of operating with New York and through the New York office to the other functions of the Shipping Board in Washington should report direct to Washington, which would then communicate with New York. It was like telling ships in convoy to wireless direct to their owners and then notify the flagship in case something suddenly happened aboard or as though the shipping control committee had elected to function from Washington instead of from New York, where the ships centered. Captain Yates protested this shearing away and offered his resignation, but the resignation was refused; we were in the middle of the war, and he kept at his post.

Now, what finally happened? This venture was a success. Its very success was its undoing. I am showing now that back in 1917 and 1918, as well as all along, the Shipping Board never intended to have the Government operate the ships with any degree of permanency or success.

He said further:

In the late autumn of 1918 and cumulatively on into the spring of 1919 announcement was made from Washington that every appointment to a ship must be referred there for approval, that no appointment must be considered made, however minor the post to be filled, until Washington had passed on it. It was becoming apparent, too, that no friendliness for the fleet as a fleet existed anywhere, either in private shipping offices or in Shipping Board circles. Incapable it could have been commended and dismissed, but successful it became too formidable an argument for Government ownership and operation, with all the disliked supervisions and comparisons that might mean for private companies owning and operating. The President was busy with peace conference plans and could not be appealed to. The knowledge that the fleet was doomed seriously discouraged the men at sea in the fleet and their inquiries as to their future were anxious. On January 21, 1919, Captain Yates sent a letter to the Director of Operations at Washington, Mr. J. H. Rossiter, part of which was as follows:

"Under dates of January 10 and 11 Mr. Hitchcock wired, instructing us to take over various steamers from Navy management and remain with Shipping Board crews. This was also confirmed by letter on January 11 by Mr. Clegg (of the shipping control committee). * * * We immediately made arrangements to provide men * * * as you will appreciate it is impossible to pick up first-class officers at the last moment. * * * As the vessels were practically new it was

our desire to man them with officers whom we knew were efficient, also having in mind, in order to avoid dissention, promotion for the men to a better-class vessel. We therefore transferred men from some of the smaller steamers under our management, replacing them with others. After all arrangements had been made we were advised that the steamship *Willimantic* and the steamship *West Kyska* would continue with Navy crew.

"We also desire to call your attention to the circumstances in connection with the steamship *Sacarappa*. We were requested by your office to man this vessel, and the necessary arrangements were made accordingly and a crew placed aboard. We were informed that the steamer had been assigned to the Red Star Line to load from New York to Antwerp, and, under instructions from the division of operations, the vessel was ordered to this port. Yesterday morning we were advised that this assignment had been canceled, and to-day we are advised by your office that the ship had been assigned to A. H. Bull & Co. for management and operation. In other words, after we had placed crew aboard and made every arrangement, the vessel was withdrawn from our management.

"Officers and men who had been in our employ for a long time were picked by us to man these ships, and most of these men prefer to remain with this organization rather than go with private companies. On the other hand, if they do go, it causes dissatisfaction on their part, and, as far as we are concerned, it means that private operators are given the advantages of the pick of our organization, which has taken us some time to build up. We are then obliged to fill their places with new men with whom we have had no previous experience or check as to their efficiency.

"We fully appreciate that there are a good many problems involved in the allocation and assignment of vessels; but the officers and crews do not appreciate this, and, after all, the success of the future American merchant marine, which we all have in mind at the present time, largely depends on these men.

"We have felt that we should call this matter to your attention, having in mind that it might be possible to make some arrangement whereby instances of this kind could be avoided in the future."

This brought back a prompt reply setting forth the policy the Shipping Board meant to follow, though there had been no formal minute of it in any proceedings, no open announcement of it, no authorization of it that had been made public or submitted to Congress. It meant the end of the Government civilian fleet and was followed within a few days by the resignation of Captain Yates, whose far-sighted policy for the fleet had been thus thrown to the discard.

Captain Yates was an experienced shipping man, a civil engineer by profession, highly educated and trained, and served in the Coast and Geodetic Survey for some years as commander of vessels and in the field work and was in charge of this business in New York by direction of the Shipping Board.

Now, listen to this reply from Mr. Rossiter, director of operations for the Shipping Board:

*** It is the declared policy of the Shipping Board to assign all its tonnage to private concerns, both for operation and management, as rapidly as possible. This with the view of building up and assisting private enterprise in organization for the increased American merchant marine.

In view of this fact, direct management of ships from the New York office of the Division of Operations must be considered only an emergency measure, and assignment of ships to that office for management is only temporary and to be terminated as rapidly as these ships can be assigned for private management.

It should be the policy of your office, in conformity with the policy of the board, to assist officers and men who have been directly in the employ of the Shipping Board to posts with private companies and explain to them the policy of the board in order to prevent dissatisfaction. ***

Just think of that. There is an order issued by the director of operations of the Shipping Board to the official in charge of the New York office and this great civilian fleet which he has been trying to build up, that—

It is the policy of the board to assign all its tonnage to private concerns, both for operation and management, as rapidly as possible. This with the view of building up and assisting private enterprise in organization for the increased merchant marine.

That was the policy back in 1918. It has been the policy ever since. How could we ever hope to succeed under such conditions as that? No matter what the men in charge of the ships did in order to increase business and to build up trade and to make a success of their undertaking, here they were on notice all the time that the policy was simply an emergency measure, that they would be expected to help private enterprise, really, on every occasion to serve private enterprise, and that they must yield every kind of advantage that they might gain by efficiency and energy and skill in order that private shipping might ultimately be in command of the whole situation.

Mr. Collins concludes:

That letter really formally marked the end of the Government civilian fleet and the beginning of a policy, informally and rapidly put into action late in 1918, to prevent a successful Government-owned, Government-managed, and Government-operated fleet from being in evidence as a working possibility in devising permanent maritime policy. The unexpected slump in shipping business came and the Government was the owner of four-sevenths of the tonnage afloat under the United States flag, so that it was not so easy as had been hastily assumed for private shipping corporations to take possession of the whole field again, but the great fleet laboriously organized to a position of complete competence was at least out of the way.

Now, that is an illustration of what has been done in the past and it shows also what has been the continued policy and effort up to the present time, and yet we are told that the

Government can not efficiently and successfully operate merchant ships.

After this was brought to my attention, which only confirmed what I had before every reason to believe had been the policy and course with reference to Government operation, I became absolutely convinced that there never had been any purpose or effort made by the Government to operate successfully the ships.

The present board by its own admissions and record makes a showing that it never intended that the Government should own and operate ships except temporarily and to as limited an extent as possible. Whatever has been accomplished in the way of approaching public satisfaction has been done in spite of their plans.

Another correspondent expresses this view:

Now, what will the passage of the subsidy bill mean? First, the tying up of possibly all of our 1,200 freight vessels, which are the real backbone of any merchant marine, for no private company will take over a losing proposition.

This is his conclusion regarding the results if the bill is enacted into law:

Second. The grabbing of all our fine passenger vessels which are now earning revenues and in addition will draw large amounts from the Government, and toward this end certain of the heads of the Shipping Board have already laid plans, along with certain shipping men who are pushing the bill, and if there are not enough plums to go around then money will be borrowed from the Government at 2 per cent interest to build more fast passenger vessels that will participate in the subsidy. Third, the Government will have to either destroy the freight vessels, scrap them, or maintain a force to look after them. There will have to be a large accounting force to distribute funds to the various steamship companies and vessels.

The writer further says:

Under the subsidy bill the *George Washington* will draw from the Government approximately \$500,000 per annum in addition to the enormous revenues shown, while the freight ships can only draw at the very most—figuring 220 days at sea during the year—\$11,000; or, in other words, a first-class freight vessel will draw from the Government in a year less than she is now losing on one single voyage, while the *Leviathan* can draw as much as \$3,000,000.

Another example, the steamship *Minnekahda*, of the Atlantic Transport Co., a subsidiary company of the International Mercantile Marine, a British-owned vessel, partially, under American registry, will draw more money on this one vessel from the subsidy than the Pacific Mail will draw on all 11 of their vessels, and the Pacific Mail is a pure American steamship company.

Can any reasonable man think that our merchant marine can become dependent on fifty million or more of the people's money for a number of years and then be dropped flat and still hold up? No; because a subsidy places a premium on waste, extravagance, careless operation, while to let the steamship companies go after their own profits as other classes of business, forces economy, thrift, ingenuity, and hard work to survive in competition.

He continues:

I am not considering the question of whether this is a raid on the United States Treasury or not, but simply whether it will be a benefit or a detriment to our merchant marine, and I can without hesitation say I feel sure it will be the greatest blow to a real substantial merchant marine and shipping industry of any legislation that could possibly be concocted, because it turns our steamship men into a bunch of swag grabbers, and the ones who are not in on the loot are forced out of business altogether.

The United States Lines and the Panama Line are two Government-owned lines and both are making money, while all the private lines that are handling our vessels are losing for the Government—not themselves—millions. Why not either operate the vessels for the people and by the people, sell them outright and let the purchasers compete with foreign shipping, assisted by sane shipping laws, or, if we must turn them over to private companies, do so on bareboat charter and not continue to encourage American shipping men to look for their profits from the pockets of American taxpayers rather than from the legitimate profits made on the carriage of cargo and passengers in competition with other nations, who have no better ships—not as good, for most of ours burn oil—have not as good crews, though ours are paid a very little more, and have no better facilities, though they have better shipping laws, and that is their sole advantage.

I have discussed this bill with the heads of various departments who really know the shipping business and are familiar with the bill, and they all agree that the bill will work contrary to the real purpose Congress and the people think it is intended.

There are certain routes on which we run our vessels, which have been a dead loss to us, and certain private American steamship companies have offered to take over these runs with their own vessels, but for reasons better known to those higher up these offers have been declined, viz: Black Diamond Steamship Co. operates vessels to European ports at heavy loss, the Luckenbach Steamship Co. offered to take over this run.

That illustrates some ways in which mistakes are being made in reference to this matter.

I have an interesting letter from another correspondent who states:

It appears that in shifting of vessels from one operator the crews are almost invariably changed, offering no inducement or incentive to the crews to keep their vessels in good condition. These changes have been made shortly before sailing, giving the new crews insufficient opportunity to get familiar with the condition of the machinery, etc., resulting in breakdowns, towage, interrupted schedules and worse than all a bad reputation for the ship with shippers. This could

and should have been prevented and remedied by the Shipping Board itself. Their reason for not doing so, so I am informed, is that they want the managing agent to have a "free hand." Therefore, this loss is not properly chargeable to Government operation but a lack of it.

Suggestions have been put forward from time to time of devising a bonus schedule for officers and crew as an inducement to economical operation—these have likewise been rejected on the ground that the board expected to abandon its operations.

This is a pertinent suggestion which any intelligent, well-informed citizen would feel is worth considering, and the people of this country are thinking about that.

How can it be said, then, that these ships are being operated as economically as possible under Government supervision? This announcement and repeated assertion on the part of the board itself that it proposed to abandon its operations has tended to discredit it with business men, who desire something permanent and dependable to assure them of proper service. The shippers of the world would be glad to do business with us if, in their own hearts, they felt that the service would be permanent and dependable. The reports of Shipping Board foreign agents emphasize this fact.

There is no reason why a bonus scheme could not be made workable for officers and crews as an inducement to economy. The Shipping Board has established similar schemes to induce operators to save money. I refer to allowances made to ships for stores and food consumption. Capt. W. E. Griffith, manager of the operating department, an ex-shipmaster of considerable experience, could, if permitted and free from the influences prevailing in the board, give valuable information on this matter.

It may be broadly stated as true that our losses have been due more to a failure of the board to exercise its authority than to its exercise of that power.

He says further:

I am inclosing herewith clipping from the New York Herald of January 29 showing how the German ships are profiting by present exchange rates. The object and purpose of the subsidy bill, as claimed by its proponents, is to equalize operating costs between American ships and British ships. How are they going to equalize so as to enable American ships to meet German, Swedish, and other maritime nations' competition? It is obvious that they have embarked upon a road that leads to an impossible end.

That clipping says:

The announcement that the big German steamship companies—the North German Lloyd and the Hamburg American Line—are to redeem on April 1 bonds that originally brought about \$25,000,000 for about \$3,500, on the basis of 28,000 marks to the dollar, serves to bring into sharp relief the great advantage in competitive operation given ship-owners of countries with depreciated currencies.

Of course a subsidy can not be provided that will equalize such a difference as that in the value of the dollar.

My correspondent continues:

Capt. Daniel A. J. Sullivan, last fall before a convention of the American Naval Architects and Engineers in New York, "bluntly told shipowners that more efficiency in the conduct of their business would place them on a par with their foreign rivals in point of operating costs"—quoting from the New York Herald.

A closer study of efficiency methods, he said, would develop valuable data which could be placed in the hands of the shipmaster, and he should be made directly responsible for economical operation and encouraged by a bonus system. This scheme has been employed by the Swedes and Norwegians with marked success.

Again referring to the "economy" of the present administration of the board, you might profitably ask why they had the barge *Wasayga* towed from the Azores in December, 1921, resulting in the stranding of the *Manatee*, tug *Butterfield*, at Bermuda, a loss to the board of upward of \$100,000, when the barge was not worth more than \$20,000. They performed this towage at the worst season of the year against the advice of seagoing men.

You might ask them why they sent the *West Cotomska* out from Baltimore on trans-Atlantic voyage June 3, 1922, with only 2,400 tons cargo, revenue \$13,434.93, without any return cargo in sight, well knowing the expense of that voyage would approximate \$30,000. I am merely citing this not as an isolated instance but as a sample of what has been happening under this so-called economy program. Many others could be enumerated.

This is somewhat in line with what happened back in 1918, and this correspondent especially emphasizes what I have already mentioned that they can not expect to succeed or to make money or to avoid losses in operating ships so long as they are doing it not as a going business, but as a temporary emergency matter, with notice to all the world that they propose to throw it up and quit just as soon as they can get somebody to take the ships off their hands.

The Senator from Minnesota intimates that politics of a partisan character is promoting those opposed to this bill. I candidly believe that a majority of Senators are opposed to the bill, but, considering the majority of 22 on the Senator's side, it would seem unwarranted to address his appeal to this side as if all the opposition existed here and no support.

He says a vote against this bill means a vote to scrap our ships. I have great respect for his judgment and confidence in his sincerity, but as in the case of any conscientious, capable man his conclusions will be erroneous if his premises are wrong, and his premises will likely be wrong if he has been misled as to the facts—if he has failed to get them all before him. I apprehend the Senator has reached a hasty conclusion based upon an incomplete examination of all the facts. For instance, if I own a

vessel and decline to sell it for about one-third its real value under a contract by which I would have agreed to pay the purchaser annually many thousand dollars, depending upon the size and speed of the vessel, to operate her for a period of 10 years, which he might have extended for 5 years more, I do not thereby lose or destroy my vessel; I still have the vessel to use, enjoy, charter, or sell as my interest may determine. If I decide to sell the vessel in the instance stated, then I would not only lose her, but bind myself to pay out a certain annual benefit to the purchaser. Furthermore, if I keep my vessel I am relieved of that obligation and burden, and I have the vessel to dispose of or employ as I see fit so long as she lives.

I can tie her up if no one wants her, or I can put her in service as conditions warrant. In the first instance, if I sell her, she is worse than scrap, because she carries with her a towline on my purse for 15 years. In the instance when I hold her she is still mine and is not scrapped at all, but is available for service when needed.

I can very well see how those who have a selfish interest to serve—those who get some benefits under a bill like this—should make every effort to have it passed, and those are about the only people who are lobbying here and bringing pressure to bear on the administration and Congress to have it passed.

It is reported, for instance, that the marine engineers, numbering 22,000, have withdrawn from the American Federation of Labor because that organization opposes the bill. The shipbuilders, some of them, believe it will help them. The ship operators believe it will help them. The United States Chamber of Commerce, composed of large manufacturers, think it will help them, and they are for it. They opposed the building of the ships. They have always opposed steps leading to the first thing to be done in the way of establishing an American merchant marine—getting the ships. Now they want to turn over the ships to private enterprise and have the Government discontinue its operation and cease to own the ships. That organization is mainly an aggregation of large manufacturers, and they favored the high protective tariff bill, the latest monstrosity of that kind, known as the Fordney-McCumber bill, which provides that whenever repairs are made in a foreign country on any American ships the owner must add 50 per cent of the cost of those repairs to his taxes in this country. He must pay 50 per cent of the cost of the repairs into the Treasury of the United States under the tariff act which we passed last year. That is a distinct handicap to American shipping. It means a tremendous burden on the American shipowner. He must either have all his repair work done in American yards at the prices which prevail here, or if he is obliged to have any of it done in foreign yards, he must add 50 per cent to the cost of it in the way of a tax upon that amount of expenditure. Repairs are very important on all these ships. They can not all be done in American yards. With any shipowner the item of repairs is the chief, the primary, source of expense and outgo, and that has to be watched very carefully. These people were in favor of that tariff bill which puts that additional handicap and burden on American shipping, and I am not surprised that they favor the ship subsidy bill.

Foreign interests have no objection to this bill. What foreign interests want to see accomplished is for the United States to go out of the shipping business. What disturbs foreign interests is the ownership and operation by the Government. The sooner you can dispose of your ships, cease to own them, and quit operating, the more you please foreign interests. That is the thing to be accomplished by this bill, as alleged by its supporters. It gets rid of the ships. It gets rid of the Shipping Board. That does not bring many tears to my eyes. My plan would be to turn over these ships to the United States Lines and to the Panama Steamship Line, in such proportions as might be determined to be wise as to passenger and cargo ships, and let these organizations take charge of them. If you want to get rid of the Shipping Board, another suggestion is, you can enlarge somewhat the Transportation Bureau in the Department of Commerce, and let that bureau get together a force of competent men and a sufficient organization to handle the ships.

If the Shipping Board wants to bid us good by, God-speed! It was never intended, however, that the Shipping Board should be abolished now, even if the ships are to be sold. There is work for them to do. I have tried to point that out in previous addresses here. There is plenty of work for the Shipping Board to do; but if they are determined that they are going to resign or quit, there are ways of surviving that great catastrophe. We can do one of the things that I mentioned, or we can do another thing: We can apportion these ships that are idle, add to them those that are losing money, if there are such, stop this "colossal loss" spoken of so proudly by the Shipping Board, tie up more of the ships, and then distribute them to the

20 or 21 or 22 harbors and ports along the Atlantic and the Gulf and the Pacific, where they have a sufficient depth of fresh water in which the ships can be anchored, taken care of, and preserved.

Apportion to these different ports these vessels that need to be tied up in order to avoid loss, and see that three or four of them in each port are kept in condition so that they may be put into service on a week's notice. Take care of them, keep them up so that they can sail on a week's notice, and as commerce revives, as business escapes from this period of intense depression, demand for ships will appear and the ships will be wanted and needed, and as they are called for they can be put into service. In the meantime we have them. The expense of taking care of them is almost nominal. It will not cost over \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 a year to care for all these ships in this way and keep up ready for service at least 10 per cent of them; and they are there, available to serve the needs of this country in their overseas trade, to carry their supplies, to bring to them the things they need, and to respond to the demand which will develop as conditions become more normal and light again begins to break for the future.

There are various ways of handling this situation that are perfectly feasible, keeping in mind that we are not compelled to dispose of these ships. We are not in the position of a debtor who is forced to dispose of his property. The act of 1920 says we shall not dispose of them as if we were forced to sell them; we shall sell them only as a prudent business man would dispose of his property. Who ever heard of a prudent business man undertaking to dispose of his assets at a time when there was no market, when there was no demand? Granting that there are no purchasers now for ships, why do you insist that we must now sell our ships? Any prudent business man would hold his property in those circumstances until the demand was created or developed. That demand is bound to come. We need about eight or ten million tons of merchant shipping to carry 50 per cent of our overseas commerce.

Everybody concedes that who knows anything about the subject. We have only about 3,000,000 tons in operation. There will be demand for the remaining 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 tons of this shipping we own now. There is no demand for it at this time. That demand is bound to come, and the sensible thing to do is not to give away our property, and, in addition to practically giving it away, pay somebody an annual amount to take it off our hands. This bill provides for a permanent appropriation of \$30,000,000 in one instance, and it provides for various other indirect benefits in various other respects that I need not take time now to relate.

Under this policy then is to be taken from the Treasury every year the annual tonnage dues now forming part of the general revenue, about \$4,000,000, and 10 per cent of customs receipts, estimated at \$42,500,000, thus necessitating other direct taxation on the people equal to the amount thus taken. Ship-owners will receive \$4,000,000 without adding a ship or purchasing a single Shipping Board vessel. Not interfering with private business, which some people stress so much, may be carried too far. It may be carried to such an extent that it would prevent people from having sufficient food in a land where food products rot in the fields. It may force them to suffer for lack of fuel with wood and coal within a few miles of them. It may oblige them to do without shelter when good lumber is burned at the mills. It may paralyze all means of distribution where production is abundant. It may shut off production where the means of distribution are sufficient. I conceive it to be worse for the country to be without carriers than for the Government to own and operate the conveyers of our commerce.

There has been some comment to the effect that certain great business interests support this measure, and it has undoubtedly met with the favor of a good many newspapers, apparently. It is conceivable that an advertising fund of over a million dollars, furnished by Congress, adroitly used by an expert, can be very effective in securing publicity of the kind desired. A paid advertisement placed in newspapers will produce returns. The opponents of this bill have had no such fund, no means of conducting a propaganda campaign; and grounds of their opposition, their reasons, their facts, and arguments receive generally but little space, where any at all is given. They have no interest behind them but the public interest, which is slow to develop in the absence of the means of reaching the public. The old saying applies, that what is everybody's business is nobody's business. But it would be a mistake to suppose that the public is in ignorance of what is proposed and what is happening.

I have here a statement from the American Farm Bureau Federation, by Mr. Gray Silver, Washington representative, re-

peating that at the annual convention of the American Bureau Federation this resolution was passed:

Inasmuch as it has been the general policy of this country to subsidize railroads by land grants, bonds, and granting special privileges; manufacturers by a protective tariff, and it is now proposed by those in charge of our general policy to subsidize our shipping interests by the payment to them of a bonus for all of which the consuming public must foot the bill; we emphatically protest against the continuance of a policy that has become confiscatory instead of protective.

I have a letter here from Mr. T. C. Atkeson, Washington representative of the National Grange, in which he sets forth a copy of a telegram furnished by the master of the Washington State Grange, Mr. A. S. Goss, in reference to the ship subsidy bill, as follows:

WESLEY L. JONES:

Have just read your statement of December 12 that ship subsidy will help farmer more than any other class. Since the farmers are practically certain that this is the opposite of the truth, I would appreciate letter from you for publication showing on what you base your statements.

A. S. Goss,
Master Washington State Grange.

I could furnish other expressions from similar sources of opposition to this bill.

I have a press statement, dated Indianapolis, Ind., February 7, to this effect:

SUBSIDY BILL DENOUNCED.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., February 7.—After Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, had addressed the board of governors of the International Allied Printing Trades Association, in session here, denouncing especially the contract feature of the ship subsidy bill, the board adopted a resolution indorsing the Federation's stand against the subsidy bill.

Every farmers' organization in the country that I know of has expressed itself as opposed to this legislation. The Middle West Merchant Marine Committee reported resolutions which appear to have been adopted at the second annual meeting of the committee, held at Milwaukee, Wis., November 27, 1922, that committee representing 90 of the leading commercial organizations in 17 States, formed for the purpose of getting the producers and consumers of the Middle West in direct and untrammelled touch with the consumers and producers of all other countries.

I ask that these resolutions may be inserted as an appendix to my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Appendix 1.)

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a communication here from a gentleman in the Northwest who has made a great study of this matter, Mr. C. C. Gilliland. He says:

I believe in subsidies if necessary, but I want to know when a loss is realized where the money went; and I believe in subsidies if honestly and fairly administered so that the North and the South, the East and the West, will all be treated alike. The present bill before Congress is not truly a subsidy bill; it is masquerading "under false colors." Because of the vicious conditions contained therein, it is my opinion that if passed it will mean the absolute destruction of our merchant marine, and which will also deprive us of our Naval Reserve and transport ships.

That is an expression from a thinker, a patriotic citizen, which I think is worthy of consideration.

In addition to that, Mr. C. E. Bell, of Hillsboro, Ohio, under date of December 15, 1922, speaking about some of the difficulties shippers have and bearing on the question of the effort to make Government operation a success, said:

To-day, as a result of an agreement on the part of what is known as the Atlantic conference, of which the Shipping Board is a part, the rate from New York to Rio de Janeiro is \$11 per ton, while freight has been carried on an open rate from Hamburg to Rio de Janeiro for \$4 per ton. The Shipping Board some months ago had a boat in the Hamburg-Rio trade and carried freight for \$4.50 per ton, at the same time demanding \$10 per ton from New York to Rio, so that the American taxpayer made good the deficit on the Hamburg-Rio boat for the benefit of the German manufacturer.

The Shipping Board said if we had freight for Rio they would be glad to make a satisfactory rate, and, as we had a carload going there, we asked them to name a rate, and through their representative we were quoted \$10 per ton, but told them we would be unable to use that rate as our agent in New York already had a rate of \$8 per ton on a Shipping Board boat.

The Shipping Board also claims that this country is at a disadvantage because of return cargoes from Mexico, Central and South America, but as a matter of record the reports show that this country exports and imports from those countries a higher percentage than does any European country.

He attaches a statement giving the freight rates and the business between these countries. I think it worth while to ask to have the statement attached as a part of my remarks. There is some valuable information in it.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Distribution of February shipments, 1922, of coffee from Santos.

	Bags.
London	216, 831
New Orleans	118, 885
Galveston	12, 250
New York	75, 711
Boston	23, 400
Rotterdam	45, 501
Hamburg	44, 887
Havre	41, 265
Antwerp	16, 574

Coffee from Rio de Janeiro, February, 1922.

	Bags.
Hamburg	21, 002
Antwerp	17, 125
New Orleans	13, 450
New York	9, 250

Hides from Rio de Janeiro and Santos, February, 1922.

New York	17, 529
Hamburg	4, 000

Bales of wool from Uruguay, October 1, 1921-February 23, 1922.

	Bales.
Hamburg	16, 502
United States	19, 962
United Kingdom	2, 455

January shipments of coffee from Rio de Janeiro.

	Bags.
New York	73, 359
New Orleans	20, 873
Trieste	56, 451
Havre	12, 821
Antwerp	16, 821
Hamburg	11, 756

Manganese from Rio de Janeiro for the year 1922.

	Tons.
Baltimore	238, 850
Philadelphia	18, 400
Rotterdam	11, 400
Hamburg	2, 521

Wool from Uruguay for the months October, November, and December.

	Bales.
United States	13, 353
Hamburg	3, 518
United Kingdom	908

Ocean freight rates.

Ports.	Miles.	Per ton.	Reference exhibit.
Liverpool to Rio de Janeiro	5, 158	\$13. 20	A.
Hamburg to Rio de Janeiro	5, 519	3. 97	K.
New York to Rio de Janeiro	4, 748	4. 07	C.
Liverpool to Vera Cruz		10. 00	B-1.
		8. 80	A.
		12. 00	B.
New York to Vera Cruz	1, 973	14. 56	B'
		20. 16	B'-B-1
New Orleans to Vera Cruz	788	11. 65	D.
		16. 80	D.
Hamburg to Vera Cruz		16. 60	F.
Hamburg to Barranquilla		6. 90	M.
New York to Barranquilla		16. 50	D C A.
Hamburg to Port Limon		6. 90	M.
New York to Port Limon		21. 00	D C A.

¹ 30 shillings.

Exports and imports.

BRAZIL.			
Year.	United States.	England.	Germany.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
1913 (to).....	394, 493	153, 406	211, 105
1913 (from).....	870, 497	2, 618, 412	505, 252
1920 (to).....	967, 233	113, 117	98, 469
1920 (from).....	1, 259, 807	253, 795	17, 213
COLOMBIA.			
1920 (to).....	161, 862		
1920 (from).....	101, 538		
VENEZUELA.			
1913 (to).....	174, 040	17, 453	25, 818
1913 (from).....	63, 107	30, 559	16, 295
1914 (to).....	111, 846	7, 250	12, 920
1914 (from).....	54, 900	20, 614	11, 083
1920 (to).....	84, 161		
1920 (from).....	60, 099	(¹)	
1921 (to).....	49, 843	669	3, 337
1921 (from).....	20, 643	4, 328	1, 105

¹ No reports.

² 6 months.

Imports and exports.

MEXICO.

[Dollars.]

Year.	Imports from, by—			Exports to, from—		
	United States.	England.	Germany.	United States.	England.	Germany.
1913.....	77, 543, 842	9, 116, 807	5, 958, 000	54, 383, 424	10, 830, 448	11, 422, 000
1914.....	92, 690, 566	8, 969, 125	38, 748, 793	3, 123, 958
1920.....	179, 331, 755	65, 205, 791	207, 858, 497	21, 070, 350
1921.....	119, 145, 533	221, 854, 304

COLOMBIA.

1913.....	15, 979, 912	5, 280, 278	3, 796, 000	7, 397, 696	8, 209, 824	4, 289, 000
1914.....	16, 051, 120	5, 287, 295	6, 786, 153	5, 654, 571
1920.....	53, 641, 738	13, 040, 006	59, 133, 277	30, 016, 703
1921.....	43, 976, 205	17, 734, 662

VENEZUELA.

1913.....	10, 852, 331	2, 716, 873	4, 913, 000	5, 737, 118	4, 101, 519	2, 216, 000
1914.....	9, 763, 069	1, 066, 845	5, 401, 396	2, 775, 233
1920.....	22, 388, 862	4, 387, 965	29, 204, 396	16, 395, 425
1921.....	11, 295, 159	9, 498, 257

BRAZIL.

1913.....	120, 155, 855	48, 540, 580	59, 008, 000	42, 638, 467	60, 455, 808	47, 546, 000
1914.....	101, 329, 073	38, 696, 365	29, 963, 914	30, 387, 447
1920.....	227, 587, 594	58, 323, 083	156, 740, 365	117, 803, 658	19, 443, 000
1921.....	96, 326, 200	58, 106, 414	16, 776, 000

¹ May to December.

There is no question, Mr. President, but that there has been a falling off of overseas commerce, necessitating the tying up of ships everywhere. It is not expected that that will continue. Germany is building fast, and other countries are keeping up their merchant shipping.

In the New York Times of December 31, 1922, I find this statement with reference to foreign trade:

[From the New York Times, December 31, 1922.]

FOREIGN TRADE OF THE COUNTRY.

In all the calculations for the future the country's foreign trade comes up as an important element. Despite the allotment of the promises of capturing far-off markets, the fact remains that those which were the best before the war still remain so. Canada, Mexico, and Cuba on this continent and the countries of central and western Europe are the ones which take most of American products. In pre-war days Europe took from one-half to two-thirds of all this country's exports, and for the first nine months of this year more than one-half of them went thither. On the other side of the ledger there has been some change. European countries, which used to send here about one-half of the total imports, sent this year less than one-third. Cotton and certain foodstuffs are the big items in the exports to Europe. Of the latter, a considerable portion comes under the head of charitable contributions. Of cotton, it is well known that much more would be taken if the European countries could pay for it. There would also be less need of charitable relief from this country if certain European countries could be made self-supporting by being enabled to ship their products here in exchange. At present financial conditions in all the countries on the Continent are at their ebb. The next few months are bound to show a betterment in this respect, because it is impossible for present conditions to continue much longer. Some *modus vivendi* will have to be established in order to escape chaos.

STATISTICS ARE TOO BELATED.

Not very long ago Secretary Hoover was quoted as expressing the opinion of a very favorable shift in the foreign commerce of this country. This was based on the statements of imports and exports of a single month and was speedily shown to be erroneous. The other day Mr. Hoover was again the authority for statements of a similar kind made to President Harding. He was reported as saying that both imports and exports had been increasing since the new tariff went into effect and as reiterating his belief that the "invisible exports" might soon result in causing exports of gold. The data for these statements are not available. No official statements of imports have been published that go beyond September 20. The complications of the new tariff are said to be the cause of the delay. But there must be something more than this. All the monthly summaries of foreign trade have been behindhand for a year or more. This may be due to a lack of facilities, in turn caused by too small appropriations. But the fact remains that American statistics of foreign commerce are usually at least five weeks behind the detailed British ones and are not of much value when they do appear because of this very delay. It is only a few days ago that the export figures, in detail, for October were published. On December 12 the complete British import and export statistics for November were available. Under such circumstances any and all kinds of opinions may be expressed by those in authority without fear of contradiction. When complete data are available it may again be shown that Secretary Hoover's conclusions are based on hope rather than on reality.

That is an important statement in connection with what we have seen as bearing on the point.

In Commerce Reports of January 8, 1923, there is a statement by the Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce concerning the foreign trade situation, which

I would like to have inserted as a part of my remarks as an appendix. The article appears on page 72 and is entitled "Survey of Industrial and Economic Conditions at the End of 1922."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Appendix 2.)

Mr. FLETCHER. There was another article in the New York Times of January 7, 1923, which I would like to have inserted as a part of my remarks. It deals somewhat with the tariff situation and bears upon the thought that there are ways of helping an American merchant marine without paying out subsidies from the Treasury of the country. There are also ways of hurting the American merchant marine. I mentioned awhile ago the provision in the tariff law about adding 50 per cent to the cost of repairs made in foreign yards. That tariff law further affects our volume of trade, and there can be no question about it. The statement in the New York Times refers to that situation. With reference, for instance, to one item, it is said:

Dealers have been taken to task by customers because of higher prices asked and have had to do much explaining. One State association of retail dry goods men is sending to its members, for their use in connection with this, a letter written "by one of the largest manufacturers and importers of gloves in New York City."

It shows the duty imposed in the tariff bill on gloves, where there is one manufacturing concern in one county in one State of the United States, as given here, to be as follows: The old duty on certain kinds was \$2 and the new duty \$6.20; the old duty on certain other kinds \$2.25, new duty \$7; on some other kinds the old duty was \$2.25, the new duty \$8.20; on some other kind, 16-button Seville, for instance, the old duty was \$4.75 and the new duty \$13.80; on 20-button overseam the old duty was \$5.70 and the new duty \$22. To the rates just cited as new rates there is added an item of 1.1 per cent exportation tax.

This case is one of many which caused high-tariff men to gnash their teeth in impotent rage when asked to explain their favorite theory that the foreigner pays the tariff. I ask to have that article inserted in the Record as an appendix to my remarks, together with an article entitled "How the tariff law operates" and still another article entitled "The vicious circle."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Appendix 3, Appendix 4, and Appendix 5.)

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I mentioned the fact that it would cost comparatively little to keep these ships, to keep them tied up as they are or distributed to the different ports, as I have suggested. I have some information that they are not properly painted and the machinery is not properly leaded and tallowed. That, of course, ought to be looked after. It would be a crying shame to have them go down and depreciate in value, when it is perfectly easy to keep them reasonably preserved. A foreigner would take care of his property, and when there was a call to put it into service the owner would get an engineer and the captain and mate on board and put it in shape, test it out, and sail. While we take our ship for instance, that needs repairs out to a dry dock and there have it repaired and spend \$25,000 or \$30,000, the foreigner would have the crew and the people in charge of the ship do most of the work.

We can learn all that by experience. We have been making progress. Mr. Lasker stated in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House, considering the independent offices appropriation bill:

I believe that the operation of the present Shipping Board is the best operation ever made by any business department of the Government.

Then he went on to say:

In the face of the way the fleet had deteriorated and the decline of freight rates, if it had not been for this particular Shipping Board, and particularly in its operations through the Emergency Fleet Corporation, instead of the present Shipping Board having cut a loss of from \$11,000,000 to \$16,000,000 a month down to \$4,000,000 a month and still kept the routes going, the losses would have been kept up and probably increased.

That is a statement to the effect that the board is growing more and more efficient and putting into force more and more economy from time to time. That would indicate that this is no time to be discouraged about Government operation.

Furthermore, in another statement Mr. Lasker said they have now got the overhead down from some \$16,000,000 a year to about \$7,500,000. There is every reason to believe from Mr. Lasker's own statement that, so far from proving Government operation impossible, he is able to demonstrate that it is entirely feasible, entirely practical, and that the board is all the while getting upon a sounder and better basis.

There was an item which appeared in the Washington Star of December 31, 1922, entitled "Shipping Board acts to cut

insurance cost in half." They were proceeding in that direction, and that is another very commendable thing to do, to reduce the losses. The losses stated, for the purpose of influencing the passage of this bill, to be \$50,000,000 are quite differently stated on other occasions.

In a statement called No. 437, July 24, 1922, which I happen to have at hand, it is said:

The next excess of outlay over income on voyage operations for May—excluding overhead, repairs, and insurance—was \$376,445.84. In June for the first time income exceeded outlay, the excess of income over outlay amounting to \$204,531.75. This improvement is due partly to the increase in passenger revenues, which for the month of June showed an excess of income over outlay—excluding overhead, repairs, and insurance—of \$354,630.78, which is an improvement of \$137,261.85 over the preceding month.

Since then that has been decreased. I ask to have that statement put in the Record as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Appendix 5.)

Mr. FLETCHER. That all bears on the question of the losses and, as I have before shown, the testimony before the committee indicated the losses would not exceed \$3,000,000 a month, that in many months less than that. This statement to which I have just referred shows that the losses have not nearly approached \$50,000,000 a year.

Now, Mr. President, a moment ago I was proceeding to dwell on the repair problem. There has been some boast on the part of the Shipping Board with reference to economies effected by reducing wages and reducing the number of men. I am very much impressed with the thought that that is not real economy. To economize by reducing the pay of skilled men is false economy. The real question of economy is missed entirely. In that connection I wish to refer to an article which was published in the Seaman of January, 1922, by Mr. Andrew Furusest, which is entitled "Reduction of crews means increase of cost." I ask to have that article inserted in the Record at the close of my remarks as an appendix.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, it is so ordered.

(See Appendix 6.)

Mr. FLETCHER. This issue of The Seaman carries a striking illustration also. I wish I could put the illustration into the Record, but the rules of the Senate do not allow it. It shows "The repair shops devouring the merchant marine," and the comment is:

The repair shops on shore and insufficient or inefficient crews on board ships represent a system of mismanagement which is certain to accomplish the complete wrecking of any merchant marine to which it is applied.

The illustration shows a ship with a serpent leading out to boiler scalers and boiler makers; another one leading out to electricians and blacksmiths; another to sailmakers and riggers; another to longshoremen and hoisters; another to carpenters and painters; another to pipe fitters and machinists; and over all are hovering vultures representing the International Shipping Federation (Ltd.), the I. W. W., and the American Steamship Owners' Association; all indicating the enemies of American shipping. It is a very graphic illustration, but, of course, I can not ask to have it inserted in the Record, but I have asked that the article by Mr. Furusest, who is thoroughly well informed on this whole subject, be printed as a part of my remarks.

My contention is that there is no reason whatever for the showing that Government operation is a costly experiment and has proven to be a failure, and therefore is not further to be thought of.

In that connection I offer and ask to have printed as an appendix at the end of my remarks a couple of short editorials from the Titusville Star-Advocate bearing on that particular point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

(See Appendix 7.)

Mr. FLETCHER. Here is the lesson. The Master said to Simon, "Put out into the deep and let your nets down for a draft."

The idea was they were fishing along the shore, taking no risks, making no serious effort, where there were no fish. Consequently they caught nothing. Simon answered, "Master, we toiled all night and took nothing." Of course, they were half-hearted, indifferent, expecting the fish to come to them instead of going after them. But "when they had done as directed they inclosed a great multitude of fishes, and Simon and James and John were amazed."

What the Shipping Board should have done and should yet do, is "Put out into the deep." If they made an earnest effort

with a sincere purpose and a genuine determination to succeed in a great business enterprise they would get returns in the establishment of an American merchant marine.

Mr. President, it has been recently asserted that the Panama Steamship Co. as a Government enterprise has suffered heavy losses and that there have been serious deficits, particularly for the last year. Heretofore in discussing this bill I referred to the success of the Panama Steamship Line as an evidence of what could be done under Government operation. I was taken to task about that by the New York Tribune and the Philadelphia Inquirer. The New York Tribune in its issue of December 12, 1922, undertakes to say:

The Panama Railroad Steamship Co., which, with the Panama Railroad, is owned by the War Department, had a net deficit during the fiscal year ended June 30 of \$587,332.45, according to the annual report made public yesterday. This figure compares with a loss last year of \$700,810.22. The company attributes the poor showing to the depression that has affected all shipping industries and particularly to the rate war waged between the United Fruit Co. and the Shipping Board service operated by the Clyde Line.

This company is the one to which Senator FLETCHER, of Florida, in his minority report on the ship subsidy bill, referred to as an instance of profitable operation under Government ownership. He advocated turning over the entire fleet to the Panama Line and the United States Line, which is operated directly by the Shipping Board, as an alternative to a subsidy.

The editorial then proceeds to compare the losses, and so forth.

The New York Tribune also had an editorial in its issue of December 13, 1922, which was entitled "Thrifty Spendthrifts," referring to what it calls the record of the Panama Steamship Line. Mr. Phillip Manson, of New York, wrote a communication to the editor of the Tribune dated December 16, 1922, and also another one dated January 5, 1923. I have never seen those communications published, and I doubt if they ever were published. I have, however, the permission of Mr. Manson to use them in any way I see fit, and I ask to have the two communications by Mr. Manson to the editor of the New York Tribune printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks and as a part thereof. They completely answer the critics of Government operation. I need not reiterate what Mr. Manson so conclusively sets forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

(See Appendixes 8 and 9.)

Mr. FLETCHER. The communications give the facts. Mr. Manson has been a student of this subject for a long while; he has kept up with the hearings and all the developments in and out of Congress, and also with the reports which have been made by the officials of the departments, and he knows what he is talking about. He expresses himself rather plainly, and, perhaps, rather too strongly at times in characterizing representations which have been made by people in and out of Congress. As to those portions of his communications I need not commit myself one way or the other, but I have no hesitation in indorsing the facts stated by him and the soundness of his arguments and the logic of his reasoning.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Are there attacks in those letters upon the good faith and motives of Members of Congress?

Mr. FLETCHER. Oh, no; they contain nothing of that sort.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not think the Senator would put a letter of that character in the RECORD.

Mr. FLETCHER. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But I know the temper of Mr. Manson and the character of the language he uses, not only when he is testifying but also in letters which I have seen, and I wondered whether he could write letters of the length the Senator indicates without attacking the integrity of Members of Congress.

Mr. FLETCHER. No. These communications do not undertake to question anybody's motives. They simply represent efforts on the part of Mr. Manson to correct statements made by the Tribune as to the facts which developed in the hearings and as shown by the reports of the Panama Steamship Co. He has, I think, no comment to make regarding any differences with Members of Congress. I have read over the communications, and I do not find anything in them which the Senator could regard as objectionable in that respect.

We are not, of course, confined to the views of others or the arguments of others, but here is a report of the board of directors of the Panama Railroad Co. to the stockholders for 1922. At page 23 it refers to the steamship line, and says:

The total operating revenues of the company's steamship line were \$2,723,985.58, a decrease of \$2,268,765.54 as compared with the 12 months ending June 30, 1921; operating expenses for same period were

\$3,443,490.39, as against \$5,850,407.22 for the preceding year, a decrease of \$2,406,916.83. The net operating deficit resulting therefrom decreased \$138,151.29 as compared with loss for prior year.

Passenger traffic shows a decrease in revenue of \$115,591.71. Revenue from the transportation of mails and treasure decreased \$75,442.01 and \$20,099.33, respectively.

Then the report gives the total tonnage transported in the 12 months ending June 30, 1922, and shows that 197,099 tons were carried by the company's steamers and 55,767 tons by chartered steamers.

Then under the head of "General remarks" this statement is made:

The operations of the Panama Railroad Steamship Line during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, although more favorable than for the preceding year, resulted in a deficit of \$587,332.45, after charging to operating expenses \$358,429.44, account of depreciation and general and extraordinary repairs. The primary cause for loss was the continued worldwide depression in business, with its consequent heavy decrease in tonnage transported; the marked lowering of rates of freight owing to the severe competition of direct lines operating between south Pacific and east coast Colombian ports and New York; the unsettled exchange situation, which, with the curtailment of credits previously granted by American merchants to South American merchants, compelled the latter to buy and sell in Europe instead of, as formerly, buying and selling in the United States, and the continued high cost of foodstuffs, stores, and material.

In pursuance of the company's policy all freight and passengers carried for account of the United States Government during the year were charged for at material reductions from regular tariff rates. Had the steamship line received tariff rates for such services its deficit of \$587,332.45 would have been reduced to approximately \$125,000.

That is the report itself; so that the loss is really reduced to \$125,000 in spite of these most depressing and unusual conditions, and yet they are charged here with having suffered a deficit of over \$500,000 up to June 30, 1922!

In that connection I am allowed to offer a letter of December 15, 1922, from Mr. W. R. Pfizer, assistant to the president, to Mr. Manson, which gives a statement concerning this alleged deficit, and the reasons and occasions therefor. I think it is due the Panama Steamship Line, and will be simply furnishing the truth on this subject, to have that letter printed as a part of my remarks, and I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

(See Appendix 10.)

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, this letter says—and I simply refer to that part of it—

The combined operations of the Panama Railroad and its steamship line while under Government control from 1904 to 1921, resulted in a net surplus of approximately \$23,000,000 (of which the steamship line contributed \$5,500,000).

That is one of the results. The fact is that for something like 20 years they have had only 2 years when there was a deficit, and this letter explains the circumstances under which that occurred. There was a slight deficit last year—2 years in 18.

Regarding the operation of the United States Lines, in these letters which Mr. Manson has written to the New York Tribune, he refers to that undertaking, and I think sufficiently meets the claim that the United States Lines have been suffering a loss. In a letter to me of June 30 Mr. Manson adds some comments to what he has heretofore said about that, and without taking time to read that letter I should like to have it inserted in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Appendix 11.)

Mr. FLETCHER. There is another experience by another country to which it seems to me we ought to give attention. It ought to have some weight with those people who are insisting all the while that the Government is incompetent and inefficient, and can not get honest men and capable men, and can not manage an important enterprise because of its impotency and helplessness and supineness, or for other reasons. I refer to the experience which Australia has had.

As bearing on that, I have before me an article from The Round Table of December, 1922, entitled "The Commonwealth Line of Steamers," and without taking time to read very extensively from it I should like to read from a portion of it, beginning at page 189. It says:

In 1917 and 1918 the Federal Government took over 21 ex-enemy vessels and ran them as part of its line. These ships are still being used, Mr. Hughes having claimed them as part of the war indemnity. It is noteworthy that these vessels have earned much more than any other ships of the Government line, possibly because they were originally intended for the Australian trade and are more suited for it.

Of the steel steamers announced by the Government as ordered in Australia 12 were built and 6 were building at the end of 1921. Three more had been ordered and were to be built, and contracts for 2 were canceled. Of the completed steamers 6 were of the D class, 5,500 tons; and 4 of the E class of 6,100 tons. Of the steamers building all are of the E class. Two of the 8 vessels ordered are much larger ships of 12,700 tons. To these must now be added the 5 "bay" liners built for the Commonwealth Line in England. As all the world knows, Mr. Hughes went to the peace conference in 1919.

While there he became alarmed at further rumors of consolidations of the shipping ring, and apparently after consultation with Mr. Larkin, the general manager of the Commonwealth Line, persuaded his cabinet to order five large steamers of 13,850 tons, with passenger accommodation, refrigerating space, and a speed of 15 knots. In July, 1919, contracts were let for three of them to Vickers's yards, and for the remaining two to Beardmore's yards. Once again Parliament was not taken into the Government's confidence, the excuse being that the matter had to be arranged swiftly and secretly lest the shipping conference should hear of it and intimidate the English shipping yards into refusing to contract for the ships. One of these liners is expected to be finished by the end of this year, while four of them have been completed and have made their maiden voyages to Australia. These are the ships that attained notoriety this year through the action of the Australian Seamen's Union in refusing to allow the English crew to man them on the return journey and in attempting to enforce its right to select the crew in advance from among its own members. The latter claim was, in the end, successfully resisted.

This completes the actual list of the vessels of the Commonwealth Line. It comprises:

In commission—	
Australs (remaining from original purchase in 1916)-----	12
Ex-enemy ships-----	17
D-class steamers (5,500 tons)-----	6
E-class steamers (6,100 tons)-----	4 or 6
Bay liners (13,850 tons)-----	4
Building or ordered—	
E-class (6,100 tons)-----	8 or 7
For cargo (12,700 tons)-----	2
Bay liner (13,800 tons)-----	1

It is difficult to estimate the venture from a business point of view, because very little information is available in the way of intelligible balance sheets. Accounts of the Austral Line, as it is called, have been furnished with the budget papers from year to year, and these show the following profits: In 1917, £327,335; in 1918, £576,164; in 1919, £1,160,055; in 1920, £137,959. The amount of the profit made in the year ending June, 1921, was stated by Sir Joseph Cook to be £300,000, after allowing 10 per cent instead of the usual 6 per cent for depreciation.

The ex-treasurer also complained that both the Commonwealth Bank and the Commonwealth Line were keeping their profits from him. The bank carries them to reserves and the line to depreciations. Whether Sir Joseph Cook's estimate refers to the whole line or only to the Australs is not clear. The nearest approach to a complete statement of the financial position of the whole line was given by the Prime Minister to Parliament in November, 1921. He dealt with the existing financial position of each branch of the line, and then gave an aggregate estimate of the whole position. From this the following figures have been extracted:

Dr.	
Original capital cost 11 remaining Australs-----	£1,621,578
Original capital cost (valuation) 18 ex-enemy ships-----	909,315
Original capital cost 17 D and E class ships (built and building)-----	3,176,083
Original capital cost of 5 bay liners (built and building)-----	5,000,000
Total capital cost of fleet built and building-----	10,706,976
Add interest not charged on capital-----	382,000
Grand total-----	11,088,976
Cr.	
Total profits earned by Australs-----	2,993,245
Total profits earned by sailers (since sold)-----	41,382
Total profits earned by D and E ships-----	84,588
Total profits earned by ex-enemy ships-----	4,066,266
Brokerage and commissions-----	181,995
Net gain on sale of 2 Australs and 2 sailers, plus insurance on 2 Australs and 1 sailer lost-----	74,343
Net profits to June 30, 1921-----	7,441,819

This leaves a net capital of £3,647,157 after devoting all profits to writing down stock. Thus the Commonwealth has its fleet on the one hand and a liability of over £3,500,000 on the other. This means, according to Mr. Hughes, that the ships stand in to the Commonwealth at £9 5s. a ton dead weight. If, however, the total loss in wooden ships (£2,615,513) be carried by the line, the total net capital would amount to about £6,250,000, and the ships would stand in at £16 2s. 2d. per ton.

It is worth noticing that the present Federal Treasurer, Mr. Bruce, criticized Mr. Hughes's statement very acutely in the House, especially drawing attention to the age of the Australs and the ex-enemy ships. After valuing and writing off the Australs, ex-enemy ships and the D and E class at a figure considerably lower than their purchase price, Mr. Bruce reduced the tonnage to 62,500 tons, capitalized at £1,375,000. This means that the five big Bay liners, now costing the Government about £80 a ton to build, are held by the Commonwealth at £22 a ton. It is interesting to observe that the Commonwealth Line from its inception has followed the policy of not claiming in any country the immunity from the jurisdiction of the courts commonly accorded to government-owned vessels. It pays for all services, such as pilotage, including such as are charged for in the form of a rate, but does not pay income tax either in the Commonwealth or the United Kingdom.

If, then, the line is satisfactory from a financial viewpoint, what can be said of its usefulness? Its defenders make several claims for it, the chief being that it has provided further opportunities for direct shipment from all United Kingdom main ports; it has amended outward bills of lading to the advantage of Australian shippers; it has helped to enable Australian producers to get rid of primary products throughout a critical period; it has relieved the congestion of coastal shipping, making phosphates, coal, and wheat available in times of scarcity in the various Australian States; it has fostered shipbuilding in Australia; and it has prevented material increases in freights similar to those which have taken place in other trades during and since the war. All these claims probably would be conceded even by its opponents, with the exception of the last one. It is very difficult to

express an opinion on this question. On general cargo the Commonwealth Line has charged the same rates of freight as the conference lines, but what has been the effect of its competition in restraining freights now and during the war is a question that can only be answered by the directors of the conference lines. In the case of wheat the line does appear to have kept freights down. Its charges have never exceeded £7 10s. per ton to London. When this rate was fixed, in February, 1918, the ruling rate for full cargoes for British vessels was about £11 10s. per ton, and neutrals were refusing £13 15s. Whether the Commonwealth Line has actually restrained the shipping conference from becoming burdensome to Australia or not, there can scarcely be any doubt that the majority of the Australian people think it has done so.

And toward the end of 1921 this impression was very generally confirmed by the offer of Lord Inchcape to buy out the line on behalf of the shipping conference. The offer was quite clear and unequivocal, and was forwarded to Mr. Larkin, the general manager, who at once transmitted it to the Prime Minister. "I recognize and admit," the offer ran, "that the Australian Government with the taxpayers behind it can go on indefinitely, and that the conference lines may eventually be ruined. I am prepared to recommend the conference to come to an agreement with the Australian Government, either to buy its ships on reasonable terms or to suggest that they should sell their ships to the Australian Government and leave the latter a free field." Mr. Hughes, with his usual acumen, hurled this message into a committee of the federal house on the estimates. He had previously taken the House into his confidence for almost the first time in regard to the position of the Commonwealth with respect to shipping and shipbuilding, and had made the statement from which the preceding figures have been extracted. A full-dress debate on Commonwealth shipping took place, and it showed quite plainly that the majority in Parliament was strongly of opinion that Lord Inchcape's offer revealed his uneasiness at the prospect of the line's continuance, and proved that it had acted as a shield to Australian interests. On previous occasions, when Parliament had debated our shipping affairs, its main criticism had been directed against the unconstitutionality of the methods by which Mr. Hughes founded the Commonwealth Line and bought ships without consulting Parliament. Members of the opposition have always, of course, availed themselves of the wooden-ship fiasco and other administrative errors to launch attacks on the Government. But the debate of November last revealed that, despite these things, members were convinced that the line was a good thing, and that the fact that the shipping conference wanted it was only an additional reason why the Commonwealth should not give it up. The only opposition came from convinced opponents of State enterprise of any kind among the country and national parties. But the majority of these parties and the whole of the Labor Party were solidly behind the enterprise, and a motion to reduce the estimate in order to indicate that the continuance of the line was inadvisable was overwhelmingly defeated.

There is no doubt that, on the whole, this vote represents the national feeling with regard to the ships. At the same time there is a considerable distrust of the efficiency of State undertakings. So far the line has not only justified itself sentimentally and politically but also financially. Yet it is still a Government department under the Prime Minister. It needs to be freed and set under some independent authority, as has been done with the State railways and the Commonwealth bank. Mr. Hughes has indicated that this will be done, and the Governor General's speech at the opening of the second session of the current Parliament promised legislation along these lines. But the legislation has not yet been passed. The status of the general manager is apparently obscure. And there is an uneasy feeling that the line is too costly and too powerful an instrument to be subject to the risk of any kind of dictation at the whim of a political party.

That shows that the Government of Australia has made a success of the operation of ships in that country, and that the question whether the Government should give up its ships was an issue recently in the campaign in which Premier Hughes was reelected. Most of his colleagues were beaten. He has stood all along for Government ownership and Government operation of the merchant marine of Australia, and on that question the people stood by him, and the showing is that it has proven a wise policy on the part of Australia.

As to Canada, in the Canadian Annual Review I find a clipping, at page 414, to this effect:

The shipping interests of Canada had a year of difficulty in 1921; there were political troubles for those associated with the Government and in most cases reduced rates and traffic. There was, also, keen competition between Government and private lines and strong opposition expressed on behalf of the latter against Government aid being given to one set of ships at the country's expense.

There are 6 vessels yet to be delivered; the complete program of 66 vessels will provide a total of 350,000 tons. These vessels provide cargo and liner services all over the world.

Meantime, Mr. Ballantyne in the Commons, on March 29, had reviewed the C. G. Merchant Marine conditions during 1920 with sailings by different ships to Liverpool, London, and Glasgow, Cardiff, and Swansea, the British West Indies, Cuba, the Mediterranean, Straits Settlements, Java, India, Australia, and New Zealand. The minister claimed substantial gains to Canada's export trade as a result; the fixed assets were stated at \$49,243,604 (vessels at cost less depreciation), the current assets at \$3,535,653, the gross earnings at \$10,210,442, the operating expenses at \$8,738,917, and the total net earnings at \$781,460.

That is not a bad showing. On page 416 appears the statement:

At the close of the year four Government vessels were laid up in Montreal for the winter season; the final report of operations for the year showed a substantial deficit. The operating revenue for the year ended December 31, 1921, was \$10,768,828 and operating expenses \$12,979,553, with a deficit of \$2,210,724. To this had to be added interest accrued on notes to Government during the year of \$3,351,500 and re-

serve for depreciation of \$2,374,410, which, with minor items, made a total deficit of \$8,047,635. Mr. Hanna, in submitting this report, stated that "conditions existing in the steamship business throughout the world made such a result inevitable. Admittedly, from an economic standpoint, 1921 was the worst year in recent shipping experience. In addition to a general falling off in tonnage, ocean rates were reduced in some cases as much as 50 per cent. Steamship rates that would bring in a proper return did not exist, and the best rates would only pay operating expenses. While tonnage outward was fairly well maintained, the inward business, especially from the United Kingdom, continental ports, and South America, fell away to such an extent that home-bound cargo was practically impossible to obtain. On this account many voyages resulted in losses. The total loss had been substantially increased by charging depreciation at 4 per cent and interest at 5½ per cent per annum on the original cost of the vessels. The difficulties of the situation were further increased by the addition of 18 new vessels to the company's fleet during a most severe business depression."

There was no doubt as to the world conditions in shipping. Mr. Hanna explained some of the advantages of operating the C. G. M. M. in face of these losses. To Canadian trade in general and to the national railways in particular the gains had been considerable: "Large shipments, which have been handled by the merchant marine at the low rates prevailing, have provided traffic return to the national railways. Much business of this character would have been handled through foreign ports and by other or foreign railways if the company's vessels had not been available. Boards of trade throughout Canada and exporters of many products have placed on record their appreciation of the assistance the merchant marine has rendered to them, without which they claim a large amount of export business secured would have been lost to other countries."

The Canadian Pacific Railway Steamship Service held its course in 1921 along the usual lines of successful and profitable operation.

On page 419 it is said:

The Canada Steamship Lines (Ltd.): The report of this company for the year of December 31, 1920, showed fixed assets—ships, real estate, docks, etc.—of \$35,468,716, with \$6,261,584 allowed for depreciation reserve; current and working assets of \$8,017,693; leases, contracts, and good will, \$8,424,646, and a total of \$48,894,994; the liabilities included capital stock, \$24,500,000; funded debt and bonds of \$6,501,483, and current or accrued liabilities of \$7,547,999; the revenue was \$20,248,611, the expenses \$16,220,337, the net earnings \$4,028,274, and the profits of the year \$1,932,772, with a surplus of \$8,611,147.

I can not see where there is anything discouraging about that. Again, on page 420, it is stated:

The Government mail subsidies and steamship subventions for the year beginning March 31, 1921, totaled over \$700,000 for the following services not of a local nature:

Canada and Newfoundland	\$35,000
Canada, the West Indies, and South America	340,666
Canada and South Africa	146,000
Canada, Australia or New Zealand, or both (Pacific)	130,509
Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Islands	21,000
Victoria, Vancouver, and Skagway	25,000
Victoria and West Vancouver Island coast	15,000
Vancouver and northern ports of British Columbia	24,800

This shows the total amount of aid given by Canada and the purposes for which it was given, mainly mail subventions.

Some comment has been made about what Italy was doing, and I have here a statement from Fair Play, the issue of December 14, 1922, as follows:

ITALIAN SHIPPING NEWS.

GENOA, December 8.—Provision has been made by the present cabinet for the suppression of some of the subventioned steamship services. According to the Tribuna, published in Rome, the services to be suppressed are: The Trieste-Odessa, the Trieste-Curzola, the Trieste-Japan, an Adriatic service having Bari as its starting point, an Adriatic service having Ravenna as its starting point, a service known as the "Periplo della Penisola," and a Gulf of Naples service.

By the suppression of these services and a considerable reduction of the number of ports of call in the services that are maintained it is claimed that the Government will save a considerable amount of money, which will be further increased in the future by a stricter application of the Government's policy for confining to a minimum the number of services to be subventioned and for cutting down the subvention rates.

According to the Tribuna, not more than about 40 vessels will be amply sufficient to meet the requirements of the subventioned services, these 40 vessels including many of rather limited tonnage. This first step under the new "economy policy" will mean a saving to the mercantile marine budget of about 73,000,000 lire.

The market values of the principal steamship companies' shares are showing of late a considerable improvement, which is undoubtedly ascribable to brighter conditions of the country generally, the stricter discipline of the crews, and the increase in the exports.

That bears on the question that has been raised as to the alleged enormous subventions paid by Italy. I have heretofore mentioned that whereas Italy was, in pre-war times, quite generous in the matter of aid to shipping and shipyards, the policy has recently been changed, and Italy is reducing the services and the subventions, although Italy owns the ships and directs the operations of some of these services herself, and she has been keeping that up. In that respect her efforts have not been unsatisfactory or too costly. She gives another illustration of what can be accomplished by Government operation. Government operation means the extension of markets and the opening up of new trade.

In the Commerce Reports of February 5, 1923, at page 372, we find an illustration of that. Beginning at the top of the page, I read as follows:

The decrease in cargoes destined for the Hamburg-Havre range resulted from the depreciation of the German mark and the consequent elimination of Germany as a market for American wheat. Shipments to Germany during the first seven months of 1922 were 435,000 tons less than during the corresponding period of 1921. The Belgian market showed a decrease of 116,000 tons, France's share decreased 16,000 tons, and Holland's increased by 4,000 tons.

South Atlantic Europe decreased principally in shipments to the Bordeaux-Brest region of France and to Spain. This section does not normally absorb much of the United States wheat, and the falling off is largely a return to normal conditions.

The decrease of almost 800,000 tons to the west Mediterranean region occurred mainly in shipments to Italy, southern France, and Spanish Mediterranean ports. During the first seven months of 1922 shipments to Italy decreased over 644,000 tons, to southern France 47,600 tons, and to Spanish Mediterranean ports 104,600 tons. The principal causes of this decrease are unfavorable exchange rates and return of these countries to agricultural pursuits, with the consequent cultivation of large quantities of grain.

SHIPPING BOARD VESSELS OPEN NEW MARKET.

Shipments of wheat to the east Mediterranean and Black Sea region showed an increase over the corresponding period of 1921. As in the case of shipments to the Baltic region, relief measures were responsible for the increase, cargoes to Greece decreasing 45,000 tons in 1922, while those to Russia and Turkey totaled 72,000 tons—an increase of 100 per cent.

The increased shipment of wheat to the Orient is notable, indicating the establishment of a new market for American wheat through extended services by Shipping Board vessels. Heretofore this market has relied on the Australian and Indian crops. Japan is consuming more wheat than before, as a result of the efforts of its Government to establish wheat and wheat flour as an adjunct to the national diet of rice. China, which received no wheat cargoes in the 1921 period, received 22,547 tons in 1922. The Philippines and Asiatic Russia took 6,978 tons and 3,000 tons, respectively, in 1922, with no comparable shipment in 1921.

SHARE OF WHEAT CARRIED BY AMERICAN VESSELS.

The total overseas movement of wheat during January-July, 1921, was 3,883,500 tons, of which United States vessels carried 27 per cent (1,031,000 tons) and foreign vessels 73 per cent (2,852,500 tons). During the same period of 1922, overseas shipments of wheat totaled 2,459,500 tons. American vessels transporting 28 per cent (679,500 tons) and foreign vessels 72 per cent (1,780,000 tons). The employment of American bottoms in the carriage of relief supplies in 1922 increased the percentage of wheat carried under the American flag by 1 per cent.

That shows how, by the use of these vessels, we are extending our trade and opening up new markets.

The more I learn of what was done in the past and of the policy of the Shipping Board, the more I learn of what is being done and of present policies, the more I am convinced that Government operation never had a chance to prove itself. There has never been any opportunity allowed that it might succeed. Pains have been taken all along to make it a failure. When I note what has been accomplished in every instance, even by piecemeal, in chance attempts here and there under Government operation, the more I believe in it.

Heretofore I have felt that private enterprise ought to own and operate our merchant marine, although I was aware how they failed us for 50 years. Now, when it is attempted to encourage them by a draft on the taxpayers of \$30,000,000 for 10 years, and probably for 5 years more, besides granting other important benefits, I can see plainly that we can never rely on private enterprise to establish and maintain an adequate American merchant marine, and we are headed straight for the situation in which we found ourselves in 1914, when less than 10 per cent of our overseas trade was carried in American bottoms.

[At this point Mr. FLETCHER yielded to Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts and a colloquy took place, in which several Senators participated.]

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I shall be glad to continue now.

I was proceeding to say that in view of our experience, and as a result of my study of this whole question, I am satisfied that if we are ever going to have an American merchant marine of any consequence the Government must own and operate merchant ships. I do not say it must own and operate all of them; I do not mean that the Government must have an absolute monopoly; but I mean that it must have a fleet that is supplemental to the privately owned fleet—a fleet that will serve us when we most need it, that will protect our people in their rates and their commerce and open our markets, and that we will be able to bring into play as we did when we had to bring coal from England and when we had to send wheat to Russia. We were able to take those cargoes in our own ships. If we had not been, our people would have been taxed two and three times the going rates on those commodities just because we had no

ships and had to be dependent upon foreign vessels to move them.

I maintain also that the fact that the Government owns and operates merchant ships does not mean that private enterprise must abandon the field or be driven out. On the contrary, private enterprise can be encouraged and helped and benefited by the activities of the Government in this field. In my judgment, we should hold to that policy of the Government's owning and operating merchant ships and set about sincerely and honestly and earnestly to have it succeed. There is no question that it can be done. There is less question that it is best for the country. Sell those ships that we do not need to carry out this purpose and plan when we can sell them at fair prices based on market value.

Tie them up meanwhile when they are not needed and care for them. Operate directly by the Government those that are needed to serve our overseas commerce, and to put into full execution that policy looking to future needs and requirements. It will be time enough hereafter, when the plan shall have been given a fair trial, and we have settled down to stable conditions, and development shall have taken place, to consider and determine whether or not the policy should be changed or modified.

As illustrating the point that individuals will not be driven out of the business, and that it will not stifle enterprise to have the Government operate ships, I refer to the Commerce Report of January 29, at page 302:

CURRENT AMERICAN SHIPBUILDING.

On January 1, 1923, American shipyards were building, or under contract to build, for private shipowners, 218 steel vessels, of 251,858 gross tons, compared with 216 steel vessels, of 257,328 gross tons, on December 1, 1922.

Then it gives the number of vessels completed in December, showing that now, while we are claiming to be operating by the Government and while we are owning these ships, and have been for more than two years, yards are busy building for private owners, and the building is increasing all the while.

At page 170 of the Commerce Reports of January 15, 1923, the following is stated:

CURRENT AMERICAN SHIPBUILDING.

On December 1, 1922, American shipyards were building, or under contract to build, for private shipowners, 216 steel vessels of 257,828 gross tons, compared with 197 steel vessels of 258,373 gross tons on November 1, 1922.

These figures do not include Government ships or ships building or contracted for by the United States Shipping Board.

Following is a summary of reports of shipyards to the Bureau of Navigation, Department of Commerce, showing the number and gross tonnage of steel vessels under construction or contract for private owners on December 1, 1922:

Companies.	Number.	Gross tonnage.
American Bridge Co., Ambridge, Pa.	83	38,050
American Car & Foundry Co., Wilmington, Del.	6	350
American Shipbuilding Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	6	46,100
Bath Iron Works, Bath, Me.	1	800
Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd.):		
Baltimore Dry Docks Plant, Locust Point, Baltimore, Md.	1	920
Harlan Plant, Wilmington, Del.	6	2,736
Sparrows Point Plant, Sparrows Point, Md.	4	4,200
Union Plant, San Francisco, Calif.	4	29,682
Chas. Ward Engineering Works, Charleston, W. Va.	3	1,820
Dravo Contracting Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	18	6,465
Dubuque Boat & Boiler Works, Dubuque, Iowa.	1	125
Federal Shipbuilding Co., Newark, N. J.	6	15,000
Great Lakes Engineering Works, River Rouge, Mich.	2	8,550
Howard Shipyards Co., Jeffersonville, Ind.	2	995
James Rees & Sons Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	1	175
Johnson Iron Works, Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., New Orleans, La.	2	750
Kyle & Purdy (Inc.), City Island, N. Y.	2	710
Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif.	2	3,500
Manitowoc Shipbuilding Corporation, Manitowoc, Wis.	1	175
Marietta Manufacturing Co., Point Pleasant, W. Va.	11	4,050
Nashville Bridge Co., Nashville, Tenn.	2	500
Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va.	2	13,000
New York Shipbuilding Corporation, Camden, N. J.	7	29,990
The Pusey & Jones Co., Wilmington, Del.	6	7,740
Riter-Conley Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	10	9,000
Staten Island Shipbuilding Co., Mariners Harbor, N. Y.	5	2,738
Sun Shipbuilding Co., Chester, Pa.	12	14,150
Tebo Yacht Basin Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.	3	657
Todd Dry Dock & Construction Corporation, Tacoma, Wash.	1	3,000
Toledo Shipbuilding Co., Toledo, Ohio.	2	8,200
Union Construction Co., Oakland, Calif.	1	1,100
Wm. Cramp & Sons Ship & Engine Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	3	2,100
Total	216	257,328

DETAILS OF NEW CONTRACTS.

Following are the particulars of new contracts entered into during the month of November, 1922:

Vessel.	Approximate gross tonnage.	Speed.	Owner.	Trade.	Probable date of launch.
American Car & Foundry Co., Wilmington, Del.: Hull No. 565...	(1)	(1)	Chas. Warner Co.	Sand and gravel.	Spring, 1923.
Hull No. 566...	(1)	(1)	do.	do.	Do.
Hull No. 567...	(1)	(1)	do.	do.	Do.
Hull No. 568...	(1)	(1)	do.	do.	Do.
Hull No. 569...	(1)	(1)	do.	do.	Do.
Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd.), Harlan Plant, Wilmington, Del.: Hull No. 3483...	(1)	(1)	F. S. Fish	Yacht	(1)
Sparrows Point Plant, Sparrows Point, Md.: Hull No. 4216...	(1)	(1)	B. & O. R. R.	Car float	(1)
Hull No. 4217...	(1)	(1)	Hudson River Day Line.	Passenger.	(1)
Federal Shipbuilding Co., Newark, N. J.: Hull No. 76...	1,700	9	Pittsburgh Steamship Co.	Lakes	Apr. 16, 1923.
Hull No. 77...	1,700	9	do.	do.	May 1, 1923.
New York Shipbuilding Corporation, Camden, N. J.: Hull No. 278...	3,100	12½	Red "D" Line	Passenger and cargo.	Summer, 1923.
Pusey & Jones Co., Wilmington, Del.: Hull No. 1026...	920	14	Philadelphia & Reading R.R. Co.	Ferry	(1)
Hull No. 1027...	920	14	do.	do.	(1)
Sun Shipbuilding Co., Chester, Pa.: Hull No. 62...	(1)	(2)	American Dredging Co.	Oil	Dec. 10, 1922.
Hull No. 63...	(1)	(2)	New York Central R. R. Co.	do.	February, 1923.
Hull No. 64...	(1)	(2)	do.	do.	Do.
Hull No. 65...	(1)	(2)	Standard Transportation Co.	do.	March, 1923.
Hull No. 66...	(1)	(2)	Tide Water Oil Co.	do.	Do.
Hull No. 67...	(1)	(2)	do.	do.	Do.
Hull No. 68...	(1)	(2)	do.	do.	Do.
Toledo Shipbuilding Co., Toledo, Ohio: Hull No. 175...	(1)	12	Huron Transportation Co.	Cement	June, 1923.

¹ Not given.

² No power.

VESSELS COMPLETED IN NOVEMBER.

Following are the particulars of the new steel vessels completed during November, 1922, for private owners:

Vessel.	Gross tonnage.	Speed.	Owner.	Trade.
American Shipbuilding Co., Cleveland, Ohio: Fred G. Hartwell..	9,166	11½	Franklin Steamship Co.	Freight.
Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd.) Union Plant, Bethlehem, Pa.: Shasta.....	1,782	(1)	James Rolph & Co., Trustee.	Ferry.
Kyle & Purdy (Inc.), City Island, N. Y.: Bird S. Colier.....	190	10	Department of Public Welfare.	Do.
Nashville Bridge Co., Nashville, Tenn.: Wm. F. Fiske.....	96	(1)	Nashville Supply Co.	Sand.
Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va.: Ohio.....	513	(1)	E. W. Scripps	Yacht.
New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N. J.: Rock Harbor.....	943	(1)	Rockland Transportation Co.	Freight.
Rock Haven.....	943	(1)	do.	Do.

¹ Not given.

VESSELS COMPLETED IN NOVEMBER—continued.

Vessel.	Gross tonnage.	Speed.	Owner.	Trade.
The Pusey & Jones Co., Wilmington, Del.: State of Maryland.. Sun Shipbuilding Co., Chester, Pa.: "801".....	1,783	18	Seaboard-Bay Line....	Pass. and freight.
"802".....	542	(?)	Pennsylvania Railroad.	Grain.
"803".....	542	(?)	do.....	Do.
"803".....	542	(?)	do.....	Do.

¹ Not given.

SHIPPING BOARD—CARGOES CARRIED IN OVERSEA COMMERCE DURING FIRST SEVEN MONTHS, 1921 AND 1922.

[Prepared by the Bureau of Research, United States Shipping Board.]

This study of the movement of commodities in oversea commerce is based on cargoes carried by vessels clearing United States ports, and not on shipments actually originating within the United States. Shipments in bond, which do not enter into export figures but do form an important part of cargoes clearing our ports in oversea carriage, are included. For instance, Canadian wheat, although not an export from the United States, moves in bond to Portland, Me., for shipment and becomes a part of cargo clearing. In many instances, therefore, the following tables are not comparable with figures from other sources for the same period based on the export of productions of the United States.

The commodity movement in oversea cargoes for the first seven months of 1922, compared with the corresponding period of 1921, shows a steady decrease in the volume of bulk commodities and an increase in the majority of manufactured products, as shown by the following table:

Principal outbound commodities, January—July, 1921 and 1922.

Commodities.	1921		1922	
	Long tons.	Value.	Long tons.	Value.
Coal and coke.....	9,827,200	1,680,500	9,827,200	1,680,500
Petroleum and products.....	3,910,100	4,230,700	3,910,100	4,230,700
Wheat.....	3,883,500	2,459,500	3,883,500	2,459,500
Corn.....	1,078,600	1,845,000	1,078,600	1,845,000
Rye.....	208,300	411,300	208,300	411,300
Barley.....	188,200	195,100	188,200	195,100
Other grains.....	714,600	1,561,400	714,600	1,561,400
Lumber.....	853,100	1,622,700	853,100	1,622,700
Iron and steel manufactures.....	752,000	698,400	752,000	698,400
Cotton, raw.....	696,800	672,400	696,800	672,400
Wheat flour.....	567,900	696,500	567,900	696,500
Phosphates.....	407,600	265,700	407,600	265,700
Sugar.....	241,100	613,200	241,100	613,200
Machinery.....	168,800	86,200	168,800	86,200
Meat and dairy products.....	146,300	116,000	146,300	116,000
Sulphur.....	139,300	92,800	139,300	92,800
Tobacco.....	120,700	103,300	120,700	103,300
Chemicals.....	105,000	98,600	105,000	98,600
Other and general cargo.....	5,235,600	3,281,400	5,235,600	3,281,400
Total.....	29,254,700	20,730,700	29,254,700	20,730,700

Of course, as everybody knows, we have given encouragement to our shipping, and we will keep up the policy of giving American ships the monopoly of our coastwise trade. We have also assisted in other ways, and we will probably keep that up.

It appears from the Commerce Reports of November 20, 1922, at pages 497 and 498, that we have, under the ocean mail act of 1891, provided a system of contract payments at specific rates of American ocean steamers and paid out certain amounts, which I will have inserted in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN OCEAN MAILS.

(Eugene T. Chamberlain, Transportation Division.)¹

[The statistical summaries regarding United States mails in the following article are compiled from detailed figures in the unpublished report of the superintendent of foreign mails for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, furnished to the Department of Commerce through the courtesy of the Second Assistant Postmaster General.]

The only considerable payments by the Government of the United States at the present time to American merchant ships, outside of those involved in the operations of the United States Shipping Board, are the amounts paid for transportation of ocean mails to foreign countries.

The ocean mail act of 1891 provided a system of contract payments at specific rates for American ocean steamers of given rates of speed and given tonnages; but developments in shipbuilding and ocean transportation during the past third of a century have so changed conditions that the act is of no considerable present service, and during the past

¹ [This is the thirteenth in the series of articles by Mr. Chamberlain on Government subsidies to the merchant marine in various countries. Preceding articles have appeared in Commerce Reports as follows: France, May 8, page 369, August 7, page 398, and September 11, page 737; United Kingdom, July 31, page 326, and October 2, page 41; Norway, August 21, page 551, and October 30, page 302; Canada, September 4, page 679, and October 9, page 114; Japan, September 25, page 837; Australia, October 16, page 170; Denmark, October 23, page 239; Belgium, November 6, page 372.]

fiscal year only four mail routes were maintained under its provisions. The Oceanic, or Spreckels, Line, was paid \$186,384 for its contract service from San Francisco to Hawaii and Australia, supplemented by payments from the Navy Department for transportation of naval supplies to American naval stations in the Pacific. The New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co., or Ward Line, was paid \$55,752 for its mail service from New York to Vera Cruz, but this contract expired on October 31, 1922, and is not likely to be renewed. The Red D Line was paid \$65,422 under its two contracts for carrying the mails from New York to Venezuela.

All told, therefore, during the past fiscal year the expenditures under the act of 1891, sometimes called the "postal subsidy law," amounted to only \$307,558, while the total cost of carrying the American ocean mails was \$5,500,000 in round numbers, not including \$379,000 for transporting closed mails of foreign origin.

OCEAN MAIL TRANSPORTATION COSTS—TRANSATLANTIC SERVICE.

The ocean transportation of the great volume of American mails for foreign countries is paid for according to the weight carried, American steamers receiving 80 cents a pound for letters and post cards and 8 cents a pound for other articles, while foreign steamers are paid under the international postal rates 4 francs per kilo, reckoned as equivalent during the past fiscal year to 35 cents a pound for letters and post cards, and 50 centimes per kilo (4½ cents a pound) for other articles. On these bases (including payments under the act of 1891 already mentioned), the cost of transporting American ocean mails for the year ended June 30, 1922, was as follows:

Transportation costs on United States ocean mails, year ended June 30, 1922.

	American ships.	Foreign ships.	Total.
Trans-Atlantic mails.....	\$2,084,400	\$1,268,239	\$3,352,639
Trans-Pacific mails.....	744,742	163,634	908,376
Miscellaneous mails.....	1,022,622	209,656	1,232,278
Total.....	3,851,764	1,641,529	5,493,292

The trans-Atlantic mails, of course, exceeded in weight those to all the rest of the world, during the past fiscal year, comprising almost 2,800,000 pounds of letters and post cards and a little over 30,500,000 pounds of other articles. The payments to the principal steamship lines engaged in this service were as follows:

American ships:	
United States Lines.....	\$1,036,149
International Mercantile Marine.....	426,001
Red Star.....	270,751
United American Line.....	149,014
United States Mail Steamship Co.....	117,477
A. H. Bull.....	31,887
All others.....	52,820
Total to American.....	2,084,099
Foreign ships:	
Cunard.....	272,230
White Star.....	271,980
Transatlantic.....	200,003
Baltic-American.....	152,893
Red Star.....	100,717
Holland-American.....	68,797
United American.....	29,323
Scandinavian-American.....	28,921
All others.....	145,375
Total to foreign.....	1,268,239

TRANS-PACIFIC AND MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES—CLOSED MAILS.

The trans-Pacific service, of course, is concentrated in fewer lines and the volume of mails is much less—570,000 pounds of letters and post cards and nearly 11,000,000 pounds of other articles. The principal lines and payments for the past fiscal year were:

American ships:	
Admiral Line.....	\$396,543
Oceanic (Spreckels) contract.....	186,384
Pacific Mail Steamship Co.....	144,684
China Mail Steamship Co.....	12,930
All others.....	4,200
Total to American.....	744,741
Foreign ships:	
Union Steamship Co.....	56,698
Toyo Kisen Kaisha.....	30,821
Osaka Shosen Kaisha.....	28,019
Nippon Yusen Kaisha.....	17,971
Canadian Pacific.....	12,579
All others.....	17,545
Total to foreign.....	163,633

The miscellaneous service includes foreign mails to South America, the West Indies, and foreign countries and islands generally in the American Hemisphere. The weight of letters and post cards in this service was 540,000 pounds, and the weight of other articles 11,260,000 pounds. Except to South America the distances are relatively short, and mails are carried by many steamers and occasionally by sailing vessels (paid whether American or foreign, at the foreign-steamer rates). The principal lines and payments during the year ended June 30, 1922, were:

American ships:	
Munson Line.....	\$163,793
United Fruit (New York).....	156,676
United Fruit (New Orleans).....	138,263
Clyde Line.....	99,942
Grace Steamship Co.....	99,803
Panama Steamship Co.....	94,848
Red D (contract).....	65,422
Red D.....	16,995
New York & Cuba Mail (contract).....	55,752

American ships—Continued.	
New York & Cuba Mail	\$46,623
Luckenbach Steamship Co.	40,205
Bull Insular Line	19,489
Pacific Mail Steamship Co.	13,227
All others	11,804
Total to American	1,022,622
Foreign ships:	
Pacific Steam Navigation Co.	24,306
Lampport & Holt	24,172
Furness Bermuda Line	18,236
Quebec Steamship Co.	14,515
Trinidad Line	10,366
Cuyamel Fruit Co.	9,905
All others	108,155
Total to foreign	209,655

The closed mails of foreign origin, of course, are not American mails but transit mails through the United States forwarded to foreign destinations and paid for at international rates already quoted, regardless of whether the ship is American or foreign. These mails for the past year amounted to 498,000 pounds of letters and post cards and 665,000 pounds of other articles carried across the Atlantic at a cost of \$203,500 to the Post Office; in the miscellaneous service they made up 176,500 pounds of letters and post cards and 2,610,000 pounds of other articles, with a carriage cost of \$175,400.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FOREIGN MAIL SERVICE, 1914-1922.

The growth of the foreign mail service of the United States during the past nine years and the effects upon it of the war may be judged from the appropriations for each fiscal year, beginning with that which ended June 30, 1914:

1914	\$3,900,000	1919	\$5,800,000
1915	4,000,000	1920	4,700,000
1916	4,000,000	1921	4,700,000
1917	3,800,000	1922	5,920,000
1918	3,720,900		

In comparison, the British appropriations for foreign and colonial mails of the United Kingdom covering the fiscal year ended March 31, 1914, were £640,386; appropriations for the fiscal year 1921-22 were £685,470; and for the current year 1922-23 are £672,260. The weight of the foreign and colonial mails out of the United Kingdom in the year 1913-14 was 6,291,000 pounds of letters and post cards and 42,921,000 pounds of other articles; the foreign and colonial mails to the United Kingdom were 4,990,000 pounds of letters and post cards and 13,055,000 pounds of other articles. No later figures are available.

Mr. FLETCHER. There appears also in the July 31, 1922, Commerce Reports, at page 326, a statement under the head "Ocean Mail Contracts for the United Kingdom," which gives the ocean mail contract system for the United Kingdom in operation practically as in 1913. I ask to have that inserted in the RECORD without reading. This shows how baseless is the argument that we must subsidize shipping because other countries have pursued such a policy with extreme liberality.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCEAN MAIL CONTRACTS FOR THE UNITED KINGDOM.

[Assistant Trade Commissioner H. B. Allin Smith, London, June 27.]

The ocean mail contract system of the United Kingdom is in operation now practically as in 1913, although there have been several modifications to the advantage of the British Government and contributory to the companies concerned.

SERVICES BETWEEN SOUTHAMPTON AND NEW YORK.

The contract with the Cunard Steamship Co. for a mail service every Saturday from Southampton to New York, with supplemental services, now provides for a payment of £65,390 (\$317,795 at normal exchange, or \$290,272 at current exchange of \$4.44), a reduction, compared with the payment of \$330,922 in 1913. The admiralty subvention, which in 1913 was £150,000, has been reduced to £90,000, partly in consequence of the loss of the *Lusitania*.

The construction of this steamship and of the *Mauvetania* was the result of a special contract (expiring in 1927) by which the British Government assured to the Cunard Steamship Co. for 20 years a mail subsidy of £68,000 and an admiralty subvention of £150,000, together with a Government loan of £2,600,000 at 2½ per cent to insure the construction of two steamships of higher speed than the trans-Atlantic liners of the North German Lloyd. The total contract payment to the Cunard Line for trans-Atlantic service from the United Kingdom to New York was thus £218,000 in 1913; at the present time it is £155,390, a reduction of £62,610.

This reduction has been offset, however, by a contract with the White Star Line (Oceanic Steam Navigation Co.) for a mail service every Wednesday from Southampton to New York and for transportation of parcel post by all steamers of the line in return for £72,000 annually. The present contract payments by the British Government for the mail services between Southampton and New York are accordingly £137,390 (\$667,715 at normal exchange), an increase of about £10,000 over 1913. This expenditure covers subsidiary mail and parcel-post service by other steamers of the two companies.

Under the pre-war Cunard contract the Government secured two auxiliary cruisers, the *Mauvetania* and *Lusitania*, built in 1907, each of 30,750 gross tons and 25 knots speed. Under the present arrangement the Cunard contract is performed by the *Mauvetania*, as before; by the *Aquitania*, launched in 1915, of 45,650 gross tons, 24 knots speed; and by the *Berengaria* (formerly the German *Imperator*), launched in 1912, of 52,022 gross tons, 23 knots speed. The new White Star contract is performed by the *Olympic*, built in 1911, of 45,360 gross tons, 24 knots speed; the *Majestic* (formerly the German *Bismarck*), launched in 1914, of 56,000 gross tons, 24 knots speed; and the *Homerio* (formerly the German *Columbus*), launched in 1913, of 35,000 gross tons, 18 knots speed.

COMPETITION IN TRANS-ATLANTIC SERVICE.

Of quite as much importance to the companies as the mail subsidy and Admiralty subvention is the elimination of German competition

represented in the three German steamers noted above that were built for trans-Atlantic passenger trade.

The only trans-Atlantic mail steamers of 22 knots or over now in competition with the Cunard and White Star ships named are the *France*, launched in 1912, of 23,666 gross tons, 24 knots speed; the *Paris*, launched in 1917, of 33,700 gross tons, 22 knots speed; and *La Savoie*, of 11,168 gross tons, or *La Lorraine*, of 11,372 gross tons, both launched in 1900, and of 21 knots speed. These perform the weekly mail contract service from Havre to New York under agreement between the Compagnie Générale Transatlantique and the French Government. The French budget estimates for 1923 provide a subvention of 2,500,000 francs for this service, the same amount as during the current year. At the normal rate of exchange this would equal \$482,500, but at the present rate (8.2) it actually equals only \$205,000.

SERVICES TO THE FAR EAST AND AUSTRALIA.

The principal British ocean mail contract is with the Peninsular & Oriental Steamship Co. for transportation of mail from Southampton weekly to Bombay and return for £160,000, fortnightly to Shanghai and return for £50,000, and once a month to Adelaide and return for £42,500—in all, £252,500 (\$1,227,150 at normal exchange), compared with \$1,484,300 in 1913. This reduction is due to the fact that in 1913 the Australian mails were carried fortnightly, instead of monthly as at present, by the Peninsular & Oriental steamships; the Australian line of Government steamers is also beginning to carry the mails monthly, thus maintaining the pre-war regularity of service.

Even before the war, with the full measure of self-government assumed by British overseas Dominions, they also assumed a share of the naval expenditures of the British Empire and of the cost of ocean mail transportation. The colonial mail contracts are not available at the present time, and they are complicated by the fact that, in consequence of the war, the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, and British India all own and operate Government fleets of merchant ships.

The letter mails from the United Kingdom for India, China, and Australia are not dispatched at Southampton on the Peninsular & Oriental steamers, but are sent by rail to Dover and thence by special Indian mail packet to Calais. For this mail-packet service a subsidy of £10,000 is granted, increased for the present to £17,500. From Calais the mails are forwarded by French and Italian railroads to Brindisi, and thence by small, fast steamers to the Peninsula & Oriental ocean liners as they enter or leave the Suez Canal, thus gaining the time saved by the greater speed of express trains over express steamers.

For the same reason, among others, the Italian Government has not provided mail subsidies to Italian lines to the United States, as quicker dispatch for Italian mails is secured by sending them by rail to Cherbourg, Havre, or Southampton, there to embark on the British or French trans-Atlantic liners.

Incidentally it may be noted that the British Government is considering projects for the transportation of mails by aerial navigation from the United Kingdom to Egypt, India, and Australia; the French Government already has air-mail services to several points in French Africa.

SERVICES TO THE CONTINENT.

Mails from the United Kingdom for the Continent of Europe are dispatched daily by the Dover-Calais ferry of the Southeastern & Chatham Railway, the annual subsidy for this service being £30,000, as before the war. For the daily mail service from Harwich to the Hook of Holland the pre-war subsidy was £850, but this at present is under revision.

SERVICES TO SOUTH AND WEST AFRICA.

The Union of South is charged with the subsidy to the Union-Castle Line for transportation of mails between the Cape of Good Hope and England; the present arrangement, however, is not at hand. The British Post Office Department appropriates £5,070 to the ships of this line for stopping once in four weeks outward and inward bound at Ascension Island and St. Helena.

It also pays, according to the volume of mails, an approximate total of £15,355 to the African Steamship Co. and to the British & African Steam Navigation Co. for transporting the mails every Saturday from Liverpool to British possessions on the West Coast of Africa. These two arrangements are the same as before the war. So far as both British and French possessions in Africa are concerned, it is quite probable that in the near future letter mail will be transported under subvention contracts with aerial navigation companies.

[The report received from London by the Department of Commerce makes no mention of the Royal Mail Packet Co.'s subvention to the West Indies, which has been in effect with varying services and varying subsidies for nearly 80 years. Its contracts for a fortnightly service from Southampton to Trinidad (\$306,000) and for fortnightly service between Barbados and Guiana (\$121,700) expired in 1917. It is possible that they have not been renewed, as Sir Owen Phillips, president of the company, stated on several occasions in the past that the execution of the contract entailed a loss; and under existing shipping conditions that loss would doubtless be increased. It is also possible that the contract is under revision, or that the company has been accidentally omitted from the report. Information on this point will be published in a later issue of Commerce Reports.]

Mr. FLETCHER. I have other references to the Commerce Reports dealing with other phases of the matter and furnishing authority for other matters, which I will not now take the time to refer to.

I will sum up what I maintain would happen if this bill should be enacted into law.

First. It would retard the establishment of an American merchant marine and probably destroy what we have.

Second. It would encourage and promote waste, recklessness, and inefficiency.

Third. It would result in our profit-earning ships, particularly the passenger vessels, passing into the hands of private owners, to whom the Government would pay out of the Treasury and therefore out of taxes collected from the people, millions of dollars each year, as I have specified heretofore. The Government would be deprived of the ships and the profits they

would earn. The passenger ships would be the chief beneficiaries under the bill.

I have cited in the minority report various instances to show what the *America* and what the *Washington* would be entitled to and what a cargo ship would be entitled to. From \$300,000 to \$400,000 a year would come to the passenger ship now earning good profits, the best paying of the profit-paying portion of the fleet, and about \$11,000 a year would come to the cargo ships, which are the ships which move our commerce and which have always had to be depended upon for the carrying of overseas trade.

Fourth. A few of the other and best vessels would be sold at about one-third what they could be replaced for, and the purchasers of them would be paid large amounts out of the Treasury annually for their operation.

Fifth. Some of the remaining ships would continue to be operated and that would necessitate keeping up the overhead of about \$8,000,000 a year.

Mr. Lasker has said he hopes to get that down to \$7,500,000, and he thinks that will be a very great achievement. It would certainly be much less than it is costing now. He said, also, in his statement before the committee that this overhead would continue whether we operated 100 ships or 400 ships. Consequently we do not get rid of that overhead, that item which enters most largely into the cost of operating ships, and these other expenses, but we add the subsidy which the bill will carry to the overhead and to the losses now occurring, because we can not expect to immediately abandon all operation when this bill passes, nor immediately sell the ships.

In talking about these losses I want to say now, referring to the letter which the Senator from New York will have put into the Record, that it is not fair to charge against operating losses these enormous expenditures for reconditioning and for what are called repairs, but are really structural changes in the ships. We might as well charge to the cost of operating the cost of every new ship added to the line. The type of the ship has been changed at enormous expense at different times, making a passenger ship out of a cargo ship, and all that sort of thing, at enormous expense, and they want to charge that up against operating costs.

It is not fair; it is not right; it is not the truth. It is not a part of the operating cost. So they want to charge against Mr. Rosbottom the complete reconditioning and structural changes of certain ships, and they attempt to show that when that is charged against the cost of operation, along with \$360,000 for rent of pier and \$600,000 for advertising, we have thereby had certain losses. Many of these items should not be charged against operation; and that remark applies to all the shipping down the line. Wherever there is talk about sustaining losses, those losses are largely due to the fact that the ships have been reconditioned and changed at enormous expense, and that is charged up to operating cost.

Sixth. The other cargo carriers would be tied up at expense and depreciation.

If the bill does not pass, the Shipping Board should continue to operate directly the United States Line, replacing the 25-year-old ex-German tubs with proper ships for the trans-Atlantic business, having the ships always at our command and paying into the Treasury the profits they can undoubtedly make. The ex-German ships can be transferred to the Pacific, where they can be operated at a profit.

Some cargo vessels can be chartered on a bare-boat basis, and that should be done. Others can be operated on routes now well established, where they can be operated at a profit or without loss and serve American commerce, keeping rates reasonable. Where serious losses are occurring, the ships should be withdrawn. Of course, sales should be made whenever possible at a figure approaching world market prices.

These vessels not now in operation without serious losses and which can not be chartered or sold should be distributed to the 22 or more deep-water ports on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific in proportion to the existing and prospective commerce as to each port, anchored in fresh water, and a percentage of them kept in condition to be available for use on a week or 10 days' notice. Either that or turn them over to the United States Lines or the Panama Steamship Co. if we want to get rid of the Shipping Board and its activities in that direction, and let them be responsible for them, and let them find work for them, or take care of them until trade revives and there is demand for them.

The demand will come for them as soon as we recover from the intense depression of the past year or more, when ships were everywhere dragging the bottom. Trade will revive and the ships will be needed—all of them.

Ships have been tied up all over the world, in every country. Every maritime nation on earth has had merchant ships tied up at the piers waiting for business, because there was not trade enough to keep them occupied. But that will not continue.

We should denounce the old, obsolete commercial conventions, as their terms provide, and become free to provide for discriminating duties if we should find within a few years that is advisable.

We should pay such wages, provide such living conditions on board, as will secure well trained and experienced American officers and seamen, and thus keep the ships up and expedite movement and save costly repair bills.

The only Government operation we have had, to wit, the Panama Line and the United States Line, has been successful, and there is no occasion to rush into the policy of subsidizing shipping.

We should save the country from the proposed raid on the Treasury, a step which would be ineffective in accomplishing what the supporters claim, and demoralizing to the whole enterprise.

The Shipping Board should discontinue the M. O.-4 contracts and take over the ships and operate them directly. I have repeatedly shown that Government operation can be efficient and successful. The only illustrations of it are the United States Line, managed by Mr. Rosbottom for the Shipping Board, and the Panama Steamship Line, operated by the War Department, through Governor Morrow, of the Canal Zone. The agency of the Shipping Board, known as "the New York office," under Capt. Charles Yates, successfully operated 165 ships during the war, got them in and out of port, manning them, repairing them, and keeping them at sea as much as possible, and at prices as little as possible. They were operated in the normal business-like manner, and carried 20 per cent of all the supplies taken to Europe under the United States flag for both our own and our allies' armies, and made a record for quick turn around, for quick repairs, for commissary, and in other respects, not exceeded by the Navy or any private companies. It was wiped out early in 1919 by the Shipping Board, for unknown reasons.

I would be in no hurry to terminate Government operation. As a permanent maritime policy I believe it could be made to promote the prosperity of the private companies and develop a real national sea following for all the future.

Mr. President, I have not concluded what I intended to cover in these remarks, but for the present I will not pursue the subject further.

APPENDIX 1.

OCEAN DIFFERENTIALS.

Whereas at present, when distance favors the North Atlantic ports, the Shipping Board allows a differential on the ocean rates in favor of those ports; and

Whereas at present, when distance favors the South Atlantic and Gulf ports, the Shipping Board allows no differential in favor of those ports; and

Whereas such discrimination against South Atlantic and Gulf ports in ocean rates tends to nullify the building up of our trade routes and the equalization of export rail rates from the Middle West, and consequently tends to hamper the establishment of additional outlets to world markets needed by producers of the Middle West: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Shipping Board should forthwith, either abandon the differentials existing in favor of North Atlantic ports or establish a similar differential in favor of South Atlantic and Gulf ports, where distance favors those ports; and be it further

Resolved, That the contact committee appointed at the suggestion of Chairman Lasker, of the Shipping Board, by Senator JOSEPH E. RANSDELL, president of the National Merchant Marine Association, be urged to take this matter up at once with the Shipping Board.

TRAMP SHIPS.

Whereas the export movement of the agricultural and live-stock products of the Middle West and South are largely seasonal; and

Whereas such seasonal movement of bulk commodities require a flexibility of ocean transportation that can not be secured through liner or semiliner service; and

Whereas the experience of the world has demonstrated that tramp ship service operated by companies trained in that particular type of ship operation constitutes the backbone of a successful merchant marine; and

Whereas the Shipping Board has apparently, for reasons of economy, given up or delayed the building up of an independent tramp ship service; and

Whereas the large part of our Government-owned tonnage is suitable only for tramp ship operation, and can not be sold unless a market for this type of service is built up by the immediate encouragement of efficient tramp ship operators: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in the interests of the farmers and producers of the Middle West and South we urge the Shipping Board immediately to start the development of an independent tramp service through efficient tramp ship operators; and be it further

Resolved, That if the Shipping Board feels that it has not authority to do so under the provisions of the Jones Act, the pending shipping bill should in that case be amended to give the Shipping Board the necessary authority; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the President and to the chairman of the Shipping Board, and that a special committee be appointed to confer in regard to this matter with the President, the chairman of the Shipping Board, and, if necessary, with the appropriate committees of the Senate and House.

COORDINATION OF RAIL AND OCEAN TRANSPORTATION.

Whereas without coordination of rail and ocean transportation it is manifest that the agricultural producers and interior manufacturers of the country will be at a permanent disadvantage in competing with the seaboard agricultural producers of foreign countries and of seaboard manufacturers at our own ports and at foreign ports; and

Whereas agricultural producers and manufacturers of the interior must know accurately what their transportation costs will likely be to foreign countries in order that the competition of foreign producers can be effectively met, and likewise foreign buyers must know accurately what these costs are from the point of shipment to destination in order to give preference to American goods; and

Whereas the Middle West feels as its fundamental right to ship its export products of farm, factory, and mine via the ports of the United States with as much freedom as is exercised in domestic shipments and in making shipments to and from Canada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the Middle West that the rail and ocean transportation media be drawn together and made to function as one transportation system to all ports of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That permission be given to railroads and steamship lines to enter into cooperative agreements to divide their said joint rates in a manner similar to that universally pursued in the division of rates on domestic traffic and traffic with Canada.

EXPORT RAIL RATES.

Whereas the congestion of traffic and the consequent paralysis of our transportation and industrial systems, caused in 1919 and 1920 by our continued attempt to ship the great bulk of our exports through the "neck of the bottle" at the North Atlantic ports, cost us large sums of money; and

Whereas in the words of Mr. Elisha Lee, vice president of the Pennsylvania system: "The next time our country has a real revival in business we shall in all probability be confronted with the most severe congestion of railroad traffic and the greatest inadequacy of railroad facilities ever experienced in our history"; and

Whereas this congestion in the northeast has been largely caused by our export rail-rate structure, which has forced the products of the Middle West to be concentrated at or near North Atlantic ports; and

Whereas such concentration and consequent congestion can best be relieved by the building up of trade routes from other ports, which can not be successfully done without an equalization of export and import rail rates to all ports; and

Whereas in order to relieve this congestion the United States Railroad Administration in 1920 established export rail rates to the Gulf and South Atlantic on a parity with those to New York, Halifax, and St. Johns; and

Whereas an attempt is now being made on the part of certain interests to secure a readjustment of those rates to the disadvantage of the Middle West and southern ports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is now considering the question of export and import rates from all ports, be urged to maintain the equalization already granted in these rates from the Middle West, and to extend this equalization to all export rates from the Middle West, not already equalized; and to establish equalized import rates from those ports to the Middle West; and be it further

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to attend the hearings of the Interstate Commerce Commission in Philadelphia on December 11, to present this resolution to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

TRADE ROUTES.

Whereas the producers and consumers of the Middle West are vitally interested in the continued development and ultimate success of the trade routes required under section 7 of the Jones Act, from Pacific, Gulf, and South Atlantic ports, as well as from North Atlantic ports; and

Whereas the depression in foreign trade through which we have recently gone makes it impossible for the board to tell as yet which of such trade routes will ultimately prove profitable; and

Whereas the development and ultimate success of these trade routes can not be secured except by having their operation in the hands of independent companies backed by their local communities, as defined in section 2 (a) of the pending shipping bill, and not in the hands of mere agents of companies owned and controlled by other local communities and interested primarily in the development of other ports: Therefore be it

Resolved, That none of these trade routes should be discontinued as "unbusinesslike" under the terms of section 7 of the Jones Act until foreign trade conditions become more normal; and be it further

Resolved, That section 2 (b) of the pending shipping bill be amended so as to prevent monopoly in the operating as well as in the sales policy of the board, by making sure that when two trade routes are for the sake of economy temporarily operated as a unit nothing shall be done during such unified operation which will in any way interfere with the identity or ultimate success of either of such combined trade routes, or which will in any way tend to make one trade route become merely a subsidiary of the other.

[From Commerce Reports, Jan. 8, 1923.]

SURVEY OF INDUSTRIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS AT END OF 1922.

FOREIGN TRADE SITUATION.

[Julius Klein, Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.]

Certain outstanding tendencies are clearly indicated in the figures thus far available on the foreign trade of the United States for 1922: (1) There is a strong movement toward a more normal balance of trade. (2) Our exports have recently been increasing very decidedly. (3) Asia is taking a more prominent place in the whole picture, especially as a market for our exports and also as an increasingly important contributor to our imports. (4) Our purchases abroad seem to be more and more predominantly raw materials and basic commodities for further use in manufacture. In general our purchases of so-called

"tropical materials," which before the war made up approximately one-third of our imports, now constitute approximately one-half.

On the basis of statistics now available it seems probable that our favorable trade balance for the year will amount only to about \$750,000,000, as compared with nearly \$2,000,000,000 in 1921. Deducting the \$200,000,000 representing our net imports of gold, and such invisible items as remittances and tourist expenses, it is clearly evident that we have reached the end of our favorable-trade-balance period and that in the immediate future, barring unforeseen developments, our trade balance will be more in harmony with our international economic position.

The value of exports for the 11 months ended December 1, 1922, shows a decrease of about \$700,000,000, as compared with the corresponding period of 1921. This falling off is more pronounced in the case of raw foodstuffs and manufactures than in prepared foodstuffs and semimanufactures, and is due to a very large extent to the change in the price level, as indicated by a comparison on a quantitative basis for a considerable number of representative products.

An examination of our export trade from a geographical standpoint indicates a decrease during 1922, against 1921, of about 25 per cent in the value of our exports to North and South America, as compared with a decline of 20 per cent in our total trade. In value our exports to Europe show a decrease of 18 per cent, while those to Asia have decreased only 15 per cent. The tendency toward an improvement in our export trade is quite pronounced; the November shipments amounted to \$383,000,000, as compared with about \$279,000,000 in January, this representing an accentuation of the usual seasonal rise at this time. The abnormal depression during 1921 showed a decline in monthly export figures for the same period, January to November, from \$654,000,000 to \$294,000,000.

According to figures for the first nine months of 1922, our imports for that year will probably show an increase of \$410,000,000 over 1921. This is made up largely of raw materials and semimanufactures, while foodstuffs and finished manufactures show only a very slight increase. Geographically, the increased import trade is divided almost evenly between Europe and Asia, while the trade with the rest of the world shows very slight change from 1921.

APPENDIX 3.

[From New York Times, January 7, 1923.]

HOW IT HITS THE GLOVE BUYER.

Among the items in the tariff law recently enacted, the one concerning duties on gloves came in for considerable attention. Few are employed in the business and nearly all of them are in a single county in this State. Especially high duties, furthermore, are provided for kinds of gloves which have hitherto not been made in this country. Dealers have been taken to task by customers because of higher prices asked, and have had to do much explaining. One State association of retail dry goods men is sending to its members, for their use in connection with this, a letter written "by one of the largest manufacturers and importers of gloves in New York City." This states:

"According to the latest ruling of the glove appraiser at the port of New York, the advance in tariff on our lines of imported gloves is considerably in excess of what we expected. For your guidance, and to permit you to protect your stocks on hand for future make-up, we list the rate of duty that we paid prior to the passage of the Fordney-McCumber bill and the rate of duty we are compelled to pay since September 21, 1922:

	Old duty.	New duty.
Florine, 2-clasp, kid, overseam.....	\$2.00	\$3.20
Isoro, 2-clasp, kid, pique.....	2.25	7.00
Seville, 1-pearl clasp, kid, pique.....	2.25	7.00
Bandalette, 2-pearl clasps, novelty, kid, overseam.....	2.00	7.00
Capitol, 2-clasp, lamb, overseam.....	2.00	5.20
Capitol, 2-clasp, lamb, pique.....	2.25	5.60
Van Dyke, 2-clasp, kid, overseam.....	2.00	7.40
Elsinoro, 2-pearl clasps, kid, pique.....	2.25	8.00
Fielder, 4-button, semimousquetaire, kid.....	2.25	8.20
8-button mousquetaire, overseam.....	2.50	8.00
8-button Seville, mousquetaire, pique.....	2.75	9.00
12-button mousquetaire, overseam.....	3.50	11.75
12-button Seville, mousquetaire, pique.....	3.75	12.20
16-button mousquetaire, overseam.....	4.50	12.64
16-button Seville, mousquetaire, pique.....	4.75	13.80
20-button mousquetaire, overseam.....	5.50	22.00

"And on all of the above new rates there is an added item of 1 1/2 per cent, exportation tax.

"The case is one of many which cause high-tariff men to gnash their teeth in impotent rage when asked to explain them on their favorite theory that 'the foreigner pays the tax.'"

APPENDIX 4.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) Press, Thursday afternoon, January 4, 1923.]

HOW THE TARIFF LAW OPERATES.

Manufacturers of woolen fabrics and cotton textiles, to whom the Fordney-McCumber profiteers' tariff law has given the power to tax the American people almost at will, are taking their tolls in such measure that they are nearly all able to divide millions of dollars among their stockholders. Some of the concerns to which the Fordney-McCumber law has brought fine Christmas gifts and the amounts of these presents are the following:

Wanskuck Co., maker of worsted, increased capital stock from \$500,000 to \$8,000,000 and distributed the new shares as a stock dividend of 1,500 per cent.

York Manufacturing Co., Saco, Me., manufacturer of cloths, doubled capital stock of \$1,800,000 and declared a stock dividend of 100 per cent.

New Bedford Cotton Mills Corporation increased its capital stock from \$350,000 to \$1,050,000, and distributed a stock dividend of 200 per cent.

Davis & Brown Woolen Co., Uxbridge, Mass., expanded its capital from \$15,000 to \$500,000 to make possible a 3,333 per cent stock dividend.

The Pacific Mills, manufacturing cotton and worsted cloths, have proposed to make their capitalization \$20,000,000 instead of \$10,000,000, and the directors have recommended a 100 per cent stock dividend.

The Cornell Mills, Fall River, makers of cotton cloth, have announced increase of their capital to permit of a 50 per cent stock dividend.

Lincoln Manufacturing Co., Fall River, is considering a recommendation of its directors that its capital stock be increased from \$1,625,000 to \$2,250,000, and that a stock dividend of 40 per cent be distributed among its shareholders.

Merrimac Woolen Co. increased its capital stock from \$750,000 to \$1,000,000 to provide for a stock dividend from capital and surplus the amount of which is not made known.

The Oakdale (R. I.) Worsted Co. increased its capital stock from \$60,000 to \$540,000 and distributed the difference in the form of an 800 per cent stock dividend.

Of course the cotton growers, sheep raisers, and other agricultural producers haven't declared any dividends recently; that is, not for themselves. They are not "protected" by the Fordney-McCumber law. The only big financial operation with which they are concerned at present is their indebtedness of \$5,000,000,000.

APPENDIX 5.

THE VICIOUS CIRCLE.

In a speech in the Senate a few days ago Senator BORAH said: "We are traveling in a vicious circle. We enacted an emergency, and also a permanent tariff bill. Nevertheless, the cry of distress from the producers of the country is even more piteous than at any time since the war. The farmer can find no markets abroad for his surplus products and without a market for his surplus products it is impossible for him to realize the value of that which he produces. We now propose to enact a ship subsidy bill but there are no cargoes to carry and no markets to supply. If we should give our millions in the way of subsidies, it would not open a single market nor supply a single cargo. These things are not produced by subsidies. There are millions of shipping tonnage lying idle now waiting to carry the cargoes which do not appear. Markets are opened and cargoes are produced by men going back to work and setting down to business, not by imposing more taxes in the way of subsidies."

The Republicans increased the tariff rates with the object of reducing imports. Of course this reduces the business done by the ships, for imports except from Canada and Mexico are brought in by ships. A reduction of imports reduces exports for the foreigner can't buy from us what we can make at less cost than he can market unless we buy from him what he offers at less cost than our own producers charge. This cuts down the need of ships again. Now, having cut down the cargoes of the shipping engaged in carrying products to and from America we propose to tax the people to make our shipping lines profitable whether they get business or not. We would, if we could, discriminate so as to bring more of the reduced shipping in American than in foreign bottoms and here again we would cut the ability of the foreigner to buy and again reduce our exports for the foreigner can make an amount of money transporting our products and can use it in paying for products they buy from us. In the interest of certain classes of this country we not only tax other classes but we also reduce their sales by making those who would buy them unable to do so.

But for the tariff our imports would be much greater and so would our exports. It is safe to say there would be 50 per cent more to carry and Americans would get a share of this increased business. We could help our shipping more by writing a tariff that was intended to encourage trade than we could by paying twice as large a subsidy as is proposed. The gain would be to the people in general. The loss would be to the protected classes for they would have to meet foreign competition and would not be able to hold up the American people as much as greed dictated and sell the balance of their products at whatever they could get for them in foreign markets. Our system makes the farmers of this country sell in the cheapest market and buy in the highest and it also gives their foreign competitors cheaper American products than they can buy.

APPENDIX 5½.

(Release Monday, July 24, 1922.)

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION, DIVISION OF INFORMATION, Washington.

(No. 437.)

Chairman Lasker, of the United States Shipping Board, made public to-day the results from the operation of vessels for the month of June.

The Shipping Board continues to cover all trading routes, so that American shippers can ship in American vessels to any port of the world.

The total expenses incurred in excess of income from vessel operations (including overhead, repairs, insurance, and lay-up expenses) were \$2,783,216.29. This result is almost as good as the result attained in May, which was the most favorable month under the present board in the operation of United States Shipping Board vessels. The corresponding excess of expenses over income for the month of May was \$2,660,486.81, or a slight increase in the month of June of \$122,729.48. The total voyages completed in May were 205 and the total voyages completed in June were 198—a decrease of 7 completed voyages.

The net excess of outlay over income on voyage operations for May (excluding overhead, repairs, and insurance) was \$376,445.84. In June, for the first time, income exceeded outlay, the excess of income over outlay amounting to \$204,531.75. This improvement is due partly to the increase in passenger revenues, which for the month of June showed an excess of income over outlay (excluding overhead, repairs, and insurance) of \$354,630.78, which is an improvement of \$137,261.65 over the preceding month.

A considerable improvement was effected in operation of cargo vessels. Excess of outlay over income in May amounted to \$863,320.47 as against \$317,816.78 in June, an improvement of \$545,503.69.

Tanker voyages decreased from 40 in May to 22 in June and for the month of June the excess of income over outlay (excluding overhead, repairs, and insurance) for tanker voyages was \$153,310.74, which is a decrease of \$114,234.67 below the preceding month.

Charter-hire receipts for the month of May were \$79,829.27 as against \$70,634.99 for the month of June.

The outlay for repairs in May amounted to \$1,019,232.65, as compared with \$1,461,016.71 for the month of June. The larger expenditure for repairs offset the better direct operating results and prevented an outstanding improvement over the May results.

In this connection a committee has recently been appointed, consisting of Commissioner T. V. O'Connor, chairman of the board, and Vice Presidents J. Barstow Smull and Edward P. Farley, and Acting Vice President Joseph E. Sheedy, of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, who are now engaged in making a survey of Shipping Board tonnage, particularly that part of the fleet which is laid up, with a view to determining what repairs and reconditioning should be undertaken at this time. When this report is made and the work recommended is undertaken, the item for repairs will of necessity increase the excess of expenses over income.

Insurance premiums for May amounted to \$329,839.88, as against \$418,873.40 for the month of June.

The lay-up expenses remained substantially the same, amounting to \$365,452.51 in May and \$365,572.61 in June.

Salaries and wages amounted in May to \$477,209 and in June to \$471,396.80.

General expenses increased from \$172,136.20 in May to \$282,523.51. These favorable results attained for the month of June are the result partly of the increased gross revenues resulting from the present heavy seasonal activity in passenger traffic and partly from the operating economies instituted and the consequent reduction in the operating expenses.

In making public this report Chairman Lasker stated that while the cost of operations is now low—and has constantly declined since the present administration has taken hold—he did not desire the impression to be conveyed that this low figure could be consistently maintained throughout the year, inasmuch as this is the best season of the year for ship operations, and passenger earnings are at a high peak. In later months, Mr. Lasker stated, large sums will have to be spent on putting the tied-up fleet in better condition.

Chairman Lasker in making public the above statement again emphasized that in its accounting the board does not figure capital charges and several forms of insurance, which the board carries itself. The chairman strongly feels that failure to include the proper proportion of capital charges in monthly cost statements does not present a true picture of the results, such as all commercial statements should reflect; these omissions, however, are in line with established practice.

APPENDIX 6.

[From the Seaman.]

REDUCTION OF CREWS MEANS INCREASE OF COST.

(By Andrew Furuseth.)

A merchant vessel is built to carry commodities and passengers across the water. When a vessel is occupied in doing this she is earning money. When she is lying in harbor she is expending money. It matters not when she is lying there idle, whether she is using an unduly long time in loading or discharging, or whether she is undergoing repairs—she is expending money. New vessels properly built are not supposed to be undergoing repairs every time they get into harbor. It has been generally stated that shipowners who really know how to handle their ships endeavor to sell them when they have to undergo serious repairs, such as getting new boilers or replacing certain parts of the engine. They sell, and then buy new vessels, taking advantage of the increased knowledge in shipbuilding with reference to the cheapness with which cargo can be handled.

Steam vessels are subject to speedy deterioration when laid up, unless the greatest of care is used in protecting such part of the machinery as is especially subject to rusting. A vessel lying without this particular care is sure to go to the repair shop before she can be put into proper use. When a vessel is running and she has a crew in sufficient number and of sufficient skill she is keeping in such condition that, excepting an accident, she never has to undergo repairs until her boilers or machinery are beginning to wear out. In order to keep a vessel out of the repair yards, therefore, it is necessary to keep her running and to have a crew sufficient in number and in skill to keep her in proper order. "A stitch in time saves nine" has a still greater application to a vessel than it has to a garment, and a highly skilled crew of sufficient number will keep a vessel in running order.

Much is said in the public press about the difference in the manning of vessels under various flags. The following figures were taken from the Pacific Marine Review, January, 1921, page 38. They were first issued in the bulletin of Dow, Jones & Co., of New York, and show difference in number of unlicensed members of crew required to man an 8,800 dead-weight ton coal-burning cargo ship under various flags:

American.

DECK DEPARTMENT.

Quartermaster	1
Carpenter	1
Boatswain	1
Able seamen	7
Ordinary seamen	3
Young men	—
Total	12

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

Deck engineer	1
Storekeeper	1
Oilers	3
Firemen	9
Coal passers	6
Total	20

STEWARD DEPARTMENT.

Chief steward	1
Chief cook	1
Second cook	1
Utility man	1
Messenger	2
Mess boys	2
Total	8

Total of unlicensed crew of American 40

<i>British.</i>	
DECK DEPARTMENT.	
Carpenter.....	1
Bosun.....	1
Able seamen.....	10
Ordinary seamen.....	2
Total.....	14
ENGINE DEPARTMENT.	
Deck engineer.....	1
Storekeeper.....	1
Oilers.....	3
Firemen.....	8
Coal passers.....	4
Total.....	17
STEWARD DEPARTMENT.	
Chief steward.....	1
Chief cook.....	1
Second cook.....	1
Utility man.....	1
Messenger.....	1
Mess boy.....	1
Total.....	6
Total of unlicensed crew of British.....	37
<i>Japanese.</i>	
DECK DEPARTMENT.	
Quartermaster.....	3
Carpenter.....	1
Boatswain.....	1
Able seamen.....	6
Ordinary seamen.....	6
Total.....	17
ENGINE DEPARTMENT.	
Deck engineer.....	1
Storekeeper.....	1
Oilers.....	6
Firemen.....	12
Coal passers.....	8
Total.....	28
STEWARD DEPARTMENT.	
Chief steward.....	1
Chief cook.....	1
Second cook.....	1
Messengers.....	8
Total.....	6
Total of unlicensed crew of Japanese.....	51
<i>Norwegian.</i>	
DECK DEPARTMENT.	
Quartermaster.....	1
Carpenter.....	1
Boatswain.....	1
Able seamen.....	5
Ordinary seamen.....	5
Young men.....	1
Total.....	14
ENGINE DEPARTMENT.	
Deck engineer.....	1
Storekeeper.....	1
Oilers.....	11
Firemen.....	4
Coal passers.....	4
Boy.....	1
Total.....	16
STEWARD DEPARTMENT.	
Chief steward.....	1
Chief cook.....	1
Mess boy.....	1
Total.....	3
Total of unlicensed crew of Norway.....	33

An American ship is supposed to carry more men in the deck department than any others, and yet this table, made up by the shipowners and published under their authority, shows that in an 8,800-dead-weight-ton coal-burning vessel the American crew was 40 unlicensed men—12 in the deck department, 20 in the engine department, and 8 in the steward department. The British ship carries 14 in the deck department, the Japanese 17 in the deck department, and the Norwegian 14 in the deck department. In the American ship we have 20 in the engine department, in the British 17, in the Japanese 28, and in the Norwegian 16. It will be noted that in the engine department the American carries 3 more than the British, 8 less than the Japanese, 4 more than the Norwegian. The real difference occurs in the steward department, where the American carries 2 more than the British, 2 more than the Japanese, and 5 more than the Norwegian. Shipowners running vessels for themselves and with the purpose of making money are not carrying any more men than they need for the proper upkeep of their vessels, and yet the United States Shipping Board

Emergency Fleet Corporation issues the following manning requirements: Single-screw coal-burning cargo vessels, from 7,001 tons to 9,000, inclusive, effective December 10, 1921:

DECK DEPARTMENT.	
Carpenter and boatswain.....	1
Able seamen.....	6
Ordinary seamen.....	2
Total.....	9
ENGINE DEPARTMENT.	
Oilers.....	3
Firemen.....	9
Coal passers.....	3
Total.....	15
STEWARD DEPARTMENT.	
Chief steward.....	1
Chief cook.....	1
Second cook and baker.....	1
Mess boys.....	3
Total.....	6
Total number of unlicensed crew.....	30

This, as will be seen, is applicable to vessels from 7,001 to 9,000 dead-weight tons, inclusive. Here we find the deck department reduced to 9, the engine department reduced to 15, and the steward department reduced to 6, making a total number of unlicensed crew of 30. This is a smaller crew than is carried by any vessel of any nation of that tonnage, figures of which are at all available.

Of course, it is absurd even to think of keeping a vessel of that size in order with a crew of this number.

It is rather difficult to understand the idea back of this sweeping reduction. American vessels built by the Shipping Board and operated by or allocated to private operators have been notorious for constant repairs. The repair bill is so great that it seems to be necessary to keep it secret. That repairs will eat up the vessels and thus bankrupt a shipping firm is a matter so well known among shipping men that they are trying to guard themselves against it by port captains and port engineers, and there are some shipping firms who have found that port captains and port engineers do not constitute safety. In one case a shipowner, who was suffering from repairs, began to examine the vessels himself, and then he began to dismiss engineers and officers that were not able to take care of the upkeep of the vessels, with the result that his vessels went less and less to the repair yards, until it practically ceased.

Of course, the United States Shipping Board is handling, to a very large extent, fabricated ships employing fabricated officers and fabricated seamen, and there was at one period some real excuse for this because of the tremendous expansion and of the fact that skill in seamanship does not grow like cabbages in the soil. Why the board should continue to use fabricated officers and fabricated seamen when skilled officers and skilled seamen are so abundant that in the last year skilled officers have been sailing in ratings in which they had no need of their certificates is very difficult to understand, and why they should reduce the number of men carried with the repair bills staring them in the face from every report seems incomprehensible.

Of course, the articles determine the number of men and the wages, and it isn't at all difficult to tell how much it costs per day while at sea. There is no room here for any juggling with figures or for padding of accounts. It surely is not possible that somebody has imposed upon the Shipping Board from sinister motives. That the repair shop or repair yard, and the stevedore can be used to eat up a ship's earnings, no matter how great they may be, can not be open to question. But there is another phase that is of equal importance. When a ship is not kept up the men on board are not learning seamanship in a sense in which the word "seamanship" is usually used by seamen. The skill that is used in a harbor in doing repair work, especially in dealing with the rigging and gear, is in the possession of men who have acquired their skill as seamen when the vessel was operated so as to develop and maintain skill. When such skill is passing from the seamen it will also pass from the longshoremen and the riggers.

It matters not what business is considered, skill is most important. Any business that employs men of low skill can not compete with other business men in the same line who employ higher skill. Really skilled men can do more with ineffective tools than unskilled men can do with the very best of tools. This is so elementary that it is difficult to understand how or why the same principle is not to apply at sea. One is forced to wonder why ordinary common sense is not, or can not be employed by men who handle ships under the American flag. It seems as if everything was being done with the deliberate purpose to destroy ships and the personnel at the same time, and as if the reduction in skill and number of men were part of this plan.

APPENDIX 7.

[From the Titusville (Fla.) Star Advocate of January 26, 1923.]

THREATENING THE SOUTH.

Florida newspapers are printing columns about taking all Shipping Board support away from Florida ports if the ship subsidy bill does not pass this Congress. The Tampa Daily Times has an article by David Lawrence, nationally known Washington correspondent, with the threat in it, concluding—

"The Shipping Board's plan of withdrawing southern trade routes is not issued as a threat to southern Senators but, etc."

Senator FLETCHER, who is leading the fight against the subsidy in the Senate, retorts that it is simply a threat to discipline him and other Senators.

The Shipping Board also intimates that Chairman Lasker and all members of the Shipping Board will resign if the subsidy bill fails. That sounds more like a promise than a threat. The Government has two gentlemen, Thomas H. Rossbottom and Capt. Charles Yates, either or both, who can organize and operate the ships better than the present Shipping Board or any other that has been appointed.

Meantime the Tampa Inter-Ocean Steamship Co., which operates the largest single fleet of Shipping Board freight ships—20 of them—announces a prosperous year. The Tampa company has branch offices in New Orleans, Galveston, New York, Savannah, Jacksonville, Barcelona, Valencia, and Shanghai.

With the Government in shipping, the South will not have less shipping; it will have more. And neglected matters like the Florida East Coast Canal will get the deep-water development they deserve, in spite of the railroads, a matter of prime importance to Titusville.

But it is curious to see the prosperity of United States shipping depending in its present crisis so much upon two southerners in Congress, Senator FLETCHER and Judge EWING L. DAVIS, of Tennessee. The present threat against them and the ports of the South is a tribute to their statesmanship.

[From Titusville, Fla., Star-Advocate, of January 9, 1923.]

SENATOR FLETCHER'S STATESMANLIKE IDEA.

Senator FLETCHER said in the Senate awhile ago:

"My proposal is this: Just as soon as possible the Shipping Board should take over and operate directly all their ships, precisely as the Government now operates the Panama Steamship Line and the United States Line. * * * Conduct the affairs on a business basis and according to business principles. I know they will say it can not be done. My answer is, try it. You have not yet given that plan a full and fair trial."

It has been done, Senator. But its very success was fatal to it.

What came to be called in Shipping Board and general maritime circles "The New York Office" was the agency of the Shipping Board that actually ran all the ships, 165 of them at the maximum, that the Government held in one great civilian fleet throughout the war. There were many ships operated by private companies, but this was the governmental undertaking. There were many cargo ships taken over by the Navy, but this was pure civilian. It was the New York office of the Division of Operations of the United States Shipping Board. But while other offices in Washington or New York or Philadelphia devised policy, or built ships, or assigned routes, or tabulated statistics, this office was the office that got the ships in and out of port, storing them, manning them, repairing them, keeping them at sea as much as possible and at piers as little as possible. These ships were operated nearer to the normal civilian basis of private shipping companies than any others, then even those of the private companies, dominated and interfered with as the private companies were throughout the war by numerous governmental war agencies.

"The New York office," as a matter of fact, had the distinction and the importance of building a stable spirit and program for the merchant marine both for the war and for peace time afterwards. Its record was a real record. Its expeditionness and its economy were matters of comment in maritime circles. But the more successful the fleet was the fewer friends it had. Though it had 8,000 men afloat under its jurisdiction and was distributing a million dollars a day: carried 20 per cent of all the supplies taken to Europe under the United States flag for both our own armies and for our allies; and had a record for quick turn around, for quick repairs, for commissary, for manning that private companies and that the Navy could not equal, it was wiped out in January of 1913, as quickly as possible after the armistice, by orders issued out of the Washington headquarters of the Shipping Board that neither Congress nor the President knew anything about.

That is part of the unrevealed history of the Government in civilian shipping. It is the only part that stands on its own feet, courting fuller knowledge of it, and yielding nothing anywhere of its claims for competence and economy and farsightedness.

Senator FLETCHER can see his statesmanlike idea in its full workings, and profit by seeing what happened to it just because it lacked Senators to be jealous about its welfare, by calling for an inquiry into the operations and the fate of "The New York office" under Capt. Charles Yates.

APPENDIX 8.

DECEMBER 16, 1922.

EDITOR NEW YORK TRIBUNE,
New York City.

SIR: Your report, in your issue of December 12, of the operations of the Panama Steamship Co. for last year is grossly misleading in its implications. The great majority of your readers would infer from your article that the "Panama Ship Co. suffers heavy losses in year" (your main heading), "United States Government-owned fleet has deficit of nearly \$600,000" (your subheading), because it is a Government line, and if it had been a privately owned and privately operated line there would have been no "heavy losses."

The propaganda character of your article and its gross unfairness is further manifested by the following paragraph taken from it:

"This company is the one to which Senator FLETCHER, of Florida, in his minority report on the ship subsidy bill, referred to as an instance of profitable operation under Government ownership. He advocated turning over the entire fleet to the Panama Line and the United States Line, which is operated directly by the Shipping Board, as an alternative to a subsidy."

Mr. T. H. Rosbottom, third vice president of the Panama Steamship Co., also general manager of the United States Lines, in his testimony before the joint congressional committee recently (p. 364 and following), said: "That during the more than 20 years of its ownership and operation by the United States Government it has made good earnings every year excepting the last two years, and most lines, even the best of the privately owned lines, had very bad earnings during the last two years, this being true of foreign lines as well as American lines." Mr. Rosbottom testified:

"We made money in the Panama Line up to about two years ago, when the depreciation in traffic and the reduction in rates resulted in a deficit, as it did with all other companies operating in that particular trade. * * * The year before last the Panama Line earned between \$1,400,000 and \$1,500,000."

This sort of testimony not being to the liking of the "statesmen" advocating the ship subsidy, the venerable chairman of the committee, Congressman GREENE, said: "I hardly can see what is to be gained from these questions."

Congressman BRIGGS and Congressman HARDY, however, insisted in developing the facts, Mr. HARDY saying: "It is a constant statement

here that the Government can not make any profit out of anything." Whereupon Mr. Rosbottom continued as follows in reply to questions from members of the committee:

Mr. Rosbottom's testimony:
"The Panama Line ever since it started, with the exception of probably two years, always made a profit ranging from \$89,000, which was, I think, the lowest, up to about \$400,000, which I think was the highest, up to the time of the beginning of the war. The year before last the profits were \$1,500,000. * * * In figuring profits we allowed for every charge that every other steamship company allows for—depreciation, interest charges, repairs, etc. I discussed all this very fully at a previous hearing of the Merchant Marine Committee when it was contemplated to abolish the Panama Steamship Co. We charged 6 per cent for depreciation each year. Privately owned lines as a rule charge only 5 per cent for depreciation. The Panama Railroad Steamship Co. has operated at a profit ever since its existence in 1893, with the exception, probably, of about three years, when it operated at a deficit. The three years at a deficit were last year and the year before that and one year about seven or eight years ago when we were in a rate war. Previous to our entering that trade the business was practically all done by foreign lines, and the rates between the United States and Central and South America were very much higher than between Europe and Central and South America. The establishment of the Panama Line reduced the rates and at the same time the line was operated at a profit. The line should not be abolished and the Government should continue to operate it."

It would take too much space to give all the evidence that was given to the committee on this matter. In fact, I am quite certain that you are fully aware of all the evidence that was given. However, the following questions and answers brought out by Senator CALDER will prove of special interest:

"Senator CALDER. Mr. Rosbottom, you said a moment ago, as I recollect it, that the Panama Line is operating at a profit?"

"Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes."

"Senator CALDER. Did you take into consideration the capital cost of the ships?"

"Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes."

"Senator CALDER. And the interest upon the capital cost?"

"Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes."

"Senator CALDER. In other words, you made a profit, allowing for interest charges?"

"Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Interest, depreciation, insurance, and repairs."

"Senator CALDER. Speaking of the profit of the Panama Line, did you not have a monopoly of that business, practically?"

"Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. No."

Mr. Rosbottom then proceeded to explain in detail that the Panama Canal Zone business was shared by the "Munson Line, which operated foreign ships, and the Hamburg-American Line and the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co." And he said further: "Our principal competitors in that traffic to the west coast were the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co., the United American Line, and sometimes the United Fruit Co."

Mr. CALDER, however, persisted in his efforts to show that the Government-owned and Government operated Panama Line is a failure and should be put out of existence. He asked: "Still, you carried practically all of the material used in the construction work to be used on the canal, did you not?"

And Mr. Rosbottom replied again, "No." And he went on to explain that they carried all of the cement at a nominal rate to the Government of \$1.25 a ton, which rate was a fraction of what the other lines charged. And yet, testified Mr. Rosbottom, notwithstanding all that, the Panama line was operated at a profit.

Senator CALDER then directed his questions toward the operation of the United States Lines; he asked, "Did I understand you to say that some of your ships in the United States Lines were being operated now at a profit?"

And Mr. Rosbottom replied, "Yes, sir."

Senator CALDER, still not satisfied, then asked, "You are operating the United States Lines in strict accordance with our existent laws? I mean, you know, we have had some complaint from the Seamen's Union and others that we were not carrying—some of our American vessels—a complete complement of American crews, as provided by law."

And Mr. Rosbottom replied, "There is no question about that. It is being operated in accordance with the law."

"Senator CALDER. It is?"

"Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes; there is no question about that."

Mr. Rosbottom proceeded to state that in addition to making a profit upon the investment, after allowing for interest, depreciation, and repairs, the Panama Line carried freight that was needed by the Government at from one-half to one-third of the rates private lines were seeking to charge; as to general cargo, the reduction was about 25 per cent, and laborers were carried back and forth at almost a nominal price—that is, \$20 to \$30 a passenger.

The last annual report of the Panama Line, which you made the subject of your propaganda article, stated that if the Government had been charged ordinary commercial rates for the freight it shipped over the Panama Line, instead of the much lower rates that are being charged, the deficit would have been only \$125,000, instead of the "nearly \$600,000" which you so gleefully blazoned in the heading of your article. And if the \$358,429.44 which the Panama Line last year charged off "for depreciation and general and extraordinary repairs" is taken into account, a less scrupulously managed company would have recorded a profit.

Considering the great depression in the steamship business, and the further fact, as made clear by the report, that in the trade covered by the Panama Steamship Co. a rate war waged last year between the United Fruit Co. and the Clyde Steamship Co., all of which resulted in the gross revenue of the Panama Steamship Co. for last year being cut almost in half, the showing of this Government-operated line is truly remarkable. It must also be borne in mind that the enemies of the Panama Steamship Co. who would legislate it out of existence because it gives the lie to their contention that the Government can not successfully operate a steamship line, leave nothing undone that will handicap and restrict the operations of this company.

I challenge you to show an instance of a privately operated steamship company, under similar circumstances, that has done as well as has the Panama Steamship Co. last year or at any other time in its history. The net surplus of the Panama Railroad Co., which includes the Panama Steamship Line, for the last fiscal year, after making the fullest provision and deductions for interest, depreciation, upkeep, and all other requirements, and after charging off all deficits, includ-

ing those which you take such great satisfaction in emphasizing in your propaganda article, is \$25,431,937.72. If you can get any satisfaction from these figures in your attempt to discredit this honestly and efficiently Government-owned and Government-operated railroad and steamship line, you are welcome to it.

In your issue of December 13 you indulge yourself further in a leading editorial on the subject, in which editorial, as is your practice when writing on a matter that you are espousing, you make many deliberate misstatements. You say that Senator FLETCHER says the subsidy bill (which you call the shipping bill) "may involve the Government in an annual expenditure of \$42,000,000." "This figure," you then say, "is too high."

As a matter of fact, the above figure is not Senator FLETCHER's figure at all. It is Chairman Lasker's figure, as developed at the recent hearings when he was subjected to a little cross-examination. He admitted that the subsidy would cost the taxpayers \$52,000,000, and Senator FLETCHER deducted \$10,000,000 representing the item of income-tax deductions which the Senate Committee on Commerce threw out, though that has not yet been passed upon. The proponents of the bill would never be so honest in the use of their opponents' figures as Senator FLETCHER has been in using Lasker's own figures.

Senator FLETCHER has submitted to the Senate a very conservative and detailed calculation of what the ship subsidy bill will actually cost the taxpayers each year. It totaled "\$72,750,000 besides other possible and contingent benefits that shipowners will receive." Representative DAVIS also made a calculation of the cost of the subsidy to the American people, and it exceeded \$75,000,000. These figures of Senator FLETCHER are well known to you, yet you falsify your editorial by making it appear that Senator FLETCHER states that the subsidy "may involve the Government in an annual expenditure of (only) \$42,000,000," when his figures are nearly double that.

Now, as to the rest of your editorial, I, though a Democrat, have been one of Wilson's severest critics because of what took place in the Shipping Board under his administration; but I have proved over and over again in my testimony before committees of both Houses of Congress, and in the public press, that the unparalleled corruption and Treasury looting that took place in the Shipping Board under Wilson's administration was committed by Republicans of national renown whom President Wilson called to his aid in the crisis created by the war, and who used their official positions and opportunities to amass fortunes for themselves, or to add to their already great fortunes, while at the same time sabotaging and making a total wreck of the legislation that created the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation, which legislation had for its specifically stated purpose the creation of a Government-owned and Government-operated merchant marine. If you will refer to my testimony on this matter before Congress you will find therein the names of some of the very distinguished Republicans who were part of the Shipping Board organization when it basely betrayed the Nation.

It was upon the recommendation of these eminent Republicans who were filling the most important posts in the Shipping Board—most of them of the 100 per cent American, dollar-a-year self-sacrificing patriot species—that Congress voted, quoting your words, "to take millions and millions out of the Treasury in order to build and maintain an ocean-going fleet." Over \$4,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money was thus appropriated, and all that the people have for it is a fleet of non-descript vessels which would not bring \$200,000,000, if it was possible to sell them all for the highest price that similar vessels can be bought for. Just think of it, ships costing over \$4,000,000,000—most of it expended long after the war had ended—would not now bring one-half of 1 per cent of what the taxpayers paid for them.

And now you dare chide Senator FLETCHER for voting with the Republican Members of Congress these "millions and millions," which I warned against at the time, as the records of Congress will show, because I saw how these distinguished Republican patriots who were administering the affairs of the Shipping Board and fixing its policies, were studiously wrecking it and betraying the American people.

Your persistence in stating that the subsidy will cost the taxpayers "from \$15,000,000 to \$30,000,000 a year," in the face of Lasker's admission that it will cost \$52,000,000, and Senator FLETCHER's and Judge DAVIS's figures showing that it will cost over \$75,000,000 a year, is characteristic of the Tribune. What is a little thing like the truth when it stands in the way of looting the Public Treasury to the tune of three-fourths of a billion to a billion dollars during the next 10 years by such good Republicans as the subsidy-seeking shipping interests, which incidentally also feed you a page or more of advertising every day.

You conclude your editorial with the following:

"Mr. FLETCHER seems, in fact, unwilling to admit, even at this late date, the failure of Government operation. He said airily in his report:

"One thing is certain, and that is there is no occasion for continuing these (Government operation) losses. If the Shipping Board can not escape them, then let them turn the ships over to the Panama Steamship Co., or to the United States Line under Mr. Rosbottom, these two concerns alone now being guilty of the offense of Government operation, and we have no doubt we will share in the experience which these lines have enjoyed up to this time, namely, a profitable and successful business."

Two days after the Fletcher report was filed the Panama Steamship Co. made its report for the fiscal year 1921-22. This disclosed a net deficit of \$587,332, compared with a net deficit of \$700,810 for the preceding year. There should be no question of the passage of the shipping bill if these are the best arguments which the Commerce Committee minority can advance against it.

The losses of the Shipping Board mentioned by Senator FLETCHER in the above-quoted statement are not "Government-operation" losses, as falsified by you by the totally unwarranted insertion of the words "Government operation" in parentheses. It was conclusively proven at the recent hearings, and so admitted by Shipping Board officials under cross-examination, that these losses are due to private operation of the Shipping Board's ships under the infamous MO-4 contract, which was deliberately contrived by officials of the Shipping Board to create such losses and insure against the successful and profitable operation of these Government-owned ships.

As to your sneering references to Senator FLETCHER's recommendations that the Shipping Board's ships be turned over to the Panama Steamship Co. and the United States Lines, and your misleading reference to the report of the Panama Steamship Co. for last year, which the figures show was better than the previous year, the fore part of this letter, I am sure, effectually disposes of that.

Yours truly,

PHILIP MANSON.

APPENDIX 9.

JANUARY 5, 1923.

The EDITOR NEW YORK TRIBUNE,
New York City.

SIR: In your issue of January 1 you give considerable space to statements made by Mr. John L. Bogert, in which he undertakes to criticize Senator FLETCHER for his opposition to the subsidy bill now before Congress. Mr. Bogert's statements, like all other prosubsidy arguments, are either false or fallacious, as I will demonstrate.

He makes the statement that "we are practically back where we were in 1914." That statement is so grossly false that it would be absurd to even discuss it. He further states, "Not one single American ship is carrying any American grain." I am not prepared at this writing to give figures as to how much American grain is being carried in American ships, but I can declare Mr. Bogert's statement to be false because I, myself, have seen American grain being loaded into American ships within the last few weeks. After stating that 102 vessels were engaged to carry grain to Europe and not one United States ship was among them, Mr. Bogert asks Senator FLETCHER if he is prepared to show that the Shipping Board is willfully withholding its ships from charter. I will say that it can be shown that the Shipping Board is willfully withholding its ships from charter, except where secret, private contracts can be made with certain of its favorites. In fact, up to quite recently the Shipping Board had a fixed policy against chartering any of its vessels. It wanted them to be operated only under the infamous MO-4 agreement by the private operators whom it favored with its ships, and it picked operators who could be depended upon to show operating losses so as to make a heavy deficit, on the strength of which they could go before Congress and demand a subsidy.

Mr. Bogert, like all other advocates of the subsidy bill, makes the totally unwarranted and false statement that the subsidy bill will give us an American merchant marine and do all the other desirable things which he enumerates. Testimony was given and evidence submitted to the joint congressional committee which held hearings on the subsidy bill proving that the passage of this bill would not only not create a permanent American merchant marine but would, on the contrary, retard it. Permit me to quote briefly from my testimony at these hearings:

"No one questions the vital need of an American merchant marine. The real question for the committee to decide is, Will subsidies create a merchant marine? I will prove to you that subsidies will not create a merchant marine, and I will also prove that subsidies will, on the contrary, seriously retard the proper development of a permanent American merchant marine.

"I ask you to carefully note the following:

"During the last three and a half years this Government has given to American shipping interests a subsidy so vast that even the most brazen subsidist would not have dared to ask for it. There was turned over to American shipping interests, free of all cost to them, a fleet of over 1,500 vessels, including some of the finest passenger ships afloat. Not only have American shipping interests had the free use of this fleet of ships, which has cost the American people over \$4,000,000,000—I say over \$4,000,000,000, because to the amount actually appropriated must be added the interest which the Government must pay on this money—but the shipping interests to whom these ships were turned over for operation received in addition from the Government hundreds of millions of dollars in cash to cover alleged losses in the operation of these ships, notwithstanding that during much of the period during which they have had these ships high freight rates prevailed and large profits should easily have been earned.

"Not only has this vast subsidy to American shipping interests during the last three and a half years failed to create a permanent American merchant marine, but it has fastened upon American shipping a curse of incompetence and graft which it will take many years to eradicate.

"In the light of these indisputable facts, how dare anyone say that a permanent American merchant marine can be created through subsidies, no matter how extensive those subsidies may be? I say to you that the only thing that subsidies will do will be to transfer from the Public Treasury to the pockets of a few favored steamship men, some of whom have appeared before this committee, large sums of the taxpayer's money; and, what is worse, it will perpetuate the graft and incompetence which is now the real reason for our failure to have a merchant marine worthy of this Nation."

Very truly yours,

PHILIP MANSON.

APPENDIX 10.

PANAMA RAILROAD CO. (PANAMA RAILROAD STEAMSHIP LINE),
New York, December 15, 1922.

MR. PHILIP MANSON,
Pacific & Eastern Steamship Co., 149 Broadway, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of the 12th instant, addressed to Mr. Drake, who we regret has been absent from the office for several weeks past because of severe illness. We are, therefore, taking the liberty of replying to him.

We have read with interest the inclosures accompanying your letter, and in accordance with your request take pleasure in inclosing copy of our annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922. As you will see from a reading of that report, the statement published in the New York Herald is not correct. In the first paragraph of the "general remarks" concerning the steamship line it is stated that the deficit of \$587,332.45 resulted "after charging to operating expenses \$358,429.44, account of depreciation and general and extraordinary repairs." Had we followed the so-called "Government accounting method" and made no allowance for depreciation and general and extraordinary repairs our deficit would have been reduced to \$228,903.01. Had we charged tariff rates for the freight and passenger service performed by our steamship line for the Government of the United States there would have been a further increase in our revenues of \$460,000.

As you undoubtedly know, we are prohibited by congressional action from covering our property by insurance. Under an act of Congress approved May 27, 1908, congressional appropriations were made available to reimburse the Panama Railroad Co. for marine losses or for losses due to destruction of or damage to its plant equipment or commissary supplies by fire, provided, however, that we should cease to carry insurance against loss from causes thereby covered. In accordance with that legislation we have carried our own insurance. Our losses have been quite heavy since that time, and the question as to

whether we have made or lost because of carrying our own insurance is a debatable one. We have not, however, called upon Congress to pay these marine losses, as we had a right to do under the act of Congress referred to, and have paid them out of our own funds.

Our steamship line was established in 1894, and up to the opening of the Panama Canal acted as a feeder for the railroad on through freight to and from Central and South America, and since its control by the Government of the United States in 1904 has accomplished more in the direction of stabilizing and establishing reasonable rates between the United States and Central and South America than all the other steamship lines put together. The opening of the Panama Canal to commerce and the discontinuance by the Panama Railroad of the practice of handling through freight across the Isthmus brought about a complete change in the operations of the steamship line in that its profitable through business was taken away from it by vessels operating through the Panama Canal and its service limited to the carrying of Government supplies and employees, necessitating the development of local traffic to Haiti, Colombia, etc., to a sufficient degree to prevent it operating at a loss.

Our operations as a whole have been successful with the exception of the past three years, when deficits were incurred for the following reasons:

1. Extreme depression throughout the world that seriously affected the trade between the United States, the Caribbean and Central and South America.
2. The high value of American money as compared with English, German, and French money, compelling South Americans to trade in Europe rather than in the United States.
3. The competition in American trade of foreign steamship lines that made it necessary for us to operate some of our steamers through the Panama Canal to the West Coast.
4. The serious competition of Shipping Board steamers under the control of managing operators, who received compensation for their services regardless as to the heavy losses sustained by the Shipping Board in their operation.

We have been able to more than hold our own against the foreign competition, but it has been impossible to profitably compete with the steamers operated for account of the Shipping Board and a great deal of the loss that we have incurred last year was due to that competition.

The rate situation with which we are now confronted is one that we called to the attention of the Shipping Board about three years ago, when we asked their approval to the plan of establishing rates between the United States and the West Coast of Central and South America to the level of the very low rates that were made effective shortly after the termination of the war by the foreign steamship lines operating between Europe and the West Coast. At that time the Shipping Board and the various operating companies saw no necessity for reducing rates to the level established by the European lines so long as the American shipper was willing to pay the higher rate.

The result of that policy is that the American shipper now has no voice in the matter, because the traffic is moving to and from Europe notwithstanding the fact that rates to and from the United States have now been considerably reduced. At the time that we offered this suggestion the American shipper controlled the traffic, and the adoption of that policy would have placed him in a position from which he could not be easily dislodged. Now the American shipper is in the position of fighting for the trade that the merchants of Europe secured because of our short-sighted policy.

In considering the status of the Panama Railroad Steamship Line very little credit is given to it by the general public for the policy it pursued in preventing unreasonable freight rates between the United States and Central and South America by maintaining equitable and reasonable rates during periods when rates could easily have been increased 100 per cent or over. Had our line been privately operated we would probably have followed the same policy as any other privately owned steamship line, but being owned by the Government of the United States we could not subject our owner to any criticism because of increasing rates beyond the point justified by our operating expenses.

The combined operations of the Panama Railroad and its steamship line while under Government control, from 1904 to 1921, resulted in a net surplus of approximately \$23,000,000, of which the steamship line contributed \$5,500,000, all of which was expended in improving facilities at the Isthmus, such as coaling plants, cold-storage plant, concrete piers, etc., which are of inestimable value in connection with the operation of the Panama Canal, and the cost of which would otherwise have been met by congressional appropriation. That net surplus, however, does not do justice to our showing, inasmuch as during that entire period we carried practically all the supplies and material that entered into the construction of the Panama Canal, as well as its employees and their families, at rates that in some instances represented actual cost while in others involving a loss. This is still our policy.

Readjustments from the abnormal conditions that prevailed during the war to the subnormal conditions that have prevailed for the past two years or more are of necessity slow, but we are beginning to see daylight a short way ahead, and we feel that it will only be a short time before we will again start to show a profit.

We shall be very glad indeed to furnish you with any detailed information that you consider would be of help to you in the very good work upon which you are engaged in defending our steamship line in the press.

Yours very truly,

W. R. PFIZER, Assistant to Vice President.

APPENDIX 11.

NEW YORK CITY, January 30, 1923.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Referring to my letter to you of January 10 regarding Lasker's statement of alleged losses by the United States Lines, my statement to you in that letter that you should not accept as correct any figures or statements submitted by the Shipping Board was confirmed the very next day. In a statement made by Mr. Rosbottom in the New York Journal of Commerce of January 11, he said that the Shipping Board charges to the operating account of the United States Lines the cost of reconditioning its ships, and of increasing their accommodations, and for other extensive repairs and structural changes which should properly be charged to capital account. You pointed this out in your remarks in the Senate on January 22. Mr. Rosbottom cited an item of this kind amounting to \$160,000

for installing additional accommodations on the steamer *President Garfield*.

Bearing on this matter, Mr. Rosbottom said: "Were charges assessed in the months that the expense is incurred it would not be quite so bad, but it often occurs that an accumulation will be dumped in on me in one month, covering perhaps several months previous."

Furthermore, excessive advertising costs are charged to the United States Lines' operations, totaling \$600,000 annually. It is pretty well known and understood that this heavy advertising expenditure is a subtle form of bribery and has been very effective in bringing to the defense of the Shipping Board and the support of the Harding administration, including the unspeakable Daugherty, and to the support of the infamous subsidy bill many newspapers which had heretofore always opposed the subsidy—a striking example being the Hearst press. Of course, all newspapers that have received this Shipping Board advertising did not succumb to this bribe, nor did the Shipping Board dare to withhold its advertising from such antisubsidy papers as the New York World, New York Times, etc., as that would have been prima facie evidence of the bribery purpose of its advertising expenditures. No private steamship line of the size and extent of the United States Lines would saddle itself with such an advertising expenditure as the Shipping Board imposes upon the United States Lines, nor would they use such extensive space in many of the mediums that the Shipping Board does.

Mr. Rosbottom also called attention to the very high rentals which the Shipping Board charges the United States Lines for piers and offices—\$360,000 a year for the Hoboken piers against \$74,000 a year paid by the International Mercantile Marine Co. and the Cunard Line for Manhattan piers, and \$120,000 a year for the United States Lines offices in the Shipping Board's building at 45 Broadway, New York.

Lasker's explanation that these rentals are based upon short-term periods is no good. The Shipping Board should give the United States Lines the benefit of the very lowest rentals for its piers and offices, inasmuch as the United States Lines is a subsidiary of the Shipping Board, which owns these piers and offices. It is a common practice for privately owned holding companies or private owners of subsidiary companies to make unfair contracts or terms with their subsidiaries, so as to drain these subsidiaries of their profits for the benefit of the holding company. In one of my appearances before the Senate Committee on Commerce I gave an instance of this in the case of the Pacific Mail Steamship Co. when it was owned by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., which, through an unfair charter for the steamers *Mongolia* and *Manchuria*, which were nominally owned by the Oregon Short Line, a railroad owned by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., diverted all of the Pacific Mail Steamship Co.'s profits so that the minority stockholders received no dividends for many years, although the Pacific Mail Steamship Co. did an enormously profitable business during all this time and would have paid handsome dividends if its earnings were not improperly diverted to the Southern Pacific Railroad Co.

Also, Lasker's explanation that because the Shipping Board paid "many times their worth" for the United States Lines ships, hence all expenditures for reconditioning and betterments must be charged to operating expenses, is no good. The United States Lines should not be loaded down with the false costs of its ships. Its ships should be considered only at their present actual worth. As a matter of fact, however, the most important of the United States Lines' ships are the ex-German liners, for which the Shipping Board paid nothing.

Mr. Lasker has himself said that the 535-foot liners, which have cost the Shipping Board between \$7,000,000 and \$8,000,000 each, and which make up part of the fleet of the United States Lines which Lasker says cost "many times their worth," are so badly built that they require expenditures of from \$25,000 to \$35,000 each trip. The United States Lines should be given credit for these extraordinary expenditures if it is compelled to use such ships.

I applaud the language you used when you said in your remarks to the Senate, "Information comes to me, which I scarcely dare to report here, about the robbery that has been taking place under the guise of repairs to ships."

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MANSON.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13793) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. STAFFORD, and Mr. SISSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13696) making appropriations for the Executive Office and for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13793) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. HITCHCOCK, and Mr. HARRIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WARREN: Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief final conference report on House bill 13696, making appropriations for the Executive Office, and so forth. It refers to two items. I ask that the report be read and agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Let that be done by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for the consideration of a final conference report on House bill 13696. The report will be read.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13696) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 10 and 25.

F. E. WARREN,
WM. J. HARRIS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

WILL R. WOOD,
L. J. DICKINSON,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word in relation to the report. I refused to sign the report as one of the conferees because, in the first place, I do not think the House conferees treated the conferees of the Senate properly.

The amendments on which the Senate conferees had to recede were the two items consisting of the steel stacks to be erected in the Pension Office Building, and the first appropriation for an archives building. The House conferees first objected to those two items but promised the conferees of the Senate that they would take them back to the House and have a vote in the House on them. I have always understood that wherever the conferees of the House promised the conferees of the Senate that an item would be taken back to the House for a separate vote the House would vote upon the item itself without any adverse expression, and particularly no bitter expression, on the part of the conferees of the House when the item was brought before the House for consideration. But as the plan is now carried out, under the House rule with reference to conferees on the part of the House, the Senate has three conferees and the House has 435. It results in there being no free conference, and there never will be a free conference between the two Houses as long as the existing rule is in operation in the House.

One member of the conferees at least went out of his way to criticize most severely the two items. I know a part of the statement he made was furnished him, prepared by some clerk or official of the Government who did not want to be deprived of some particular position or place that he is now occupying in the Pension Building. His view would no doubt be interrupted. I do not know whether it was a view outside of the building or whether it was a view inside of the building, but the gentleman did not want his view interrupted, and therefore the Government is deprived of saving \$1,000,000 in two years.

I was very much put out over the way the matter was handled. But as long as I am in the Senate of the United States and there is a responsibility resting upon me as chairman of one of the committees that must look after the records and the safe-keeping of the records of the Government I am going to call the attention of the Congress, whenever I get a chance, to the conditions that exist and ask for legislation that will bring about a change and a correction of existing situations. It is a disgrace to the Government the way our records are being kept to-day.

The proposition was one that would allow the Government of the United States under existing conditions to take space in Government buildings now occupied by old records—and some very valuable records, too—and make that space available for the employees of the Government. The commission had a plan whereby they could take all the employees out of the Wardman

Building and house them in Government-owned buildings if this provision had remained in the bill. The owners of the Wardman Building are demanding that the Government give up the building. They have told your commission that with a small expenditure of money they could get returns from that building of \$253,000 a year.

I stated upon the floor of the Senate that after the five-year lease expired, providing for a rental of \$37,500 annually for the building, I would ask for an appropriation of \$75,000, or double the amount previously paid. The owners of the building are not satisfied with that amount; but, so far as I am concerned, I shall never vote for a dollar more than \$75,000 for the annual rental of that building.

I do believe that when we had a plan mapped out and arranged that would not interfere with any working of the Government in any department, where we knew just what it would cost, where we knew that we could make space in the different Government buildings and in making that space take out wooden files and old papers, where, if a fire occurred, it perhaps would destroy the whole building, and put them into a fireproof place for safe-keeping and thus save a large amount of rent, that the item should have remained in the bill. But it is to be otherwise, because of the fact that the conferees of the House told the House itself that the conferees on the part of the House could not agree to the two items and gave reasons that are not substantiated by the facts.

I know it would be unusual to ask the Senate of the United States now to vote against the report. The House has voted already. Therefore I am not going to ask for a separate vote upon the particular items, but I am going to continue every year, as long as I am chairman of the Public Buildings Commission, to try to get through Congress some legislation that will not only save money to the Government of the United States but will put our records in a position where they will not be destroyed by fire and where they will not rot as they are doing now. Some of the most valuable records the Government has to-day, if they should be taken out of the place where they are now kept, would drop to pieces unless handled with the greatest care. In another 10 years no one will be able to read them, and they will be perfectly worthless.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that we have two or three weeks remaining of this session and I do not see why he does not want to send the items back to conference.

Mr. SMOOT. But the House has already voted on them.

Mr. SWANSON. Do we always have to accept the vote of the House as final? I think this is one of the most important matters we have had before us. I was chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for a long time and tried for 15 or 20 years to get a building in which we could take care of our valuable records and perhaps give us more space in the other Government buildings. In Government buildings like the Treasury, War, Navy, and State Buildings, we could make more space for the clerks by taking out the records and documents now kept there and placing them in an archives building. They would be safer and better kept; we would gain much additional space in the present buildings, and in addition to that we would have the records classified and the work of looking them up when needed could be done with one-third less clerks.

We have tried and tried to get this proposition accepted and I do not believe in surrendering on it. I would like to see the amendment go back to conference and have another vote on it, anyway. The only way we will get it is by persistently fighting for it. We have had it up for 10 or 15 years and every time it comes up they take a vote in the House, and they have an idea that if they vote in the House one way it is the duty of the Senate to surrender to that vote. They come to conference and say, "We have voted in the House on this proposition," and they think when they have voted, if the matter has been voted down, it is the conclusion of the matter. I, as a conferee on various bills, have ridiculed any such view. I think the Senate is a coordinate branch of the Government. I believe a vote in the Senate is entitled to as much respect as a vote in the House and is worthy of as much consideration and should be as potential with them as their vote should be with us.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Virginia that we are told that just as soon as the Senate of the United States will vote a general public buildings bill, then these items can go through; but as long as they can not have a post office at Podunk, we can not have an archives building in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SWANSON. I have served on the commission with the Senator from Utah and I know the splendid work he is doing.

I know how the buildings of the Government are crowded. The erection of an archives building and the storing of our valuable documents there would relieve the situation very greatly. I believe in an archives building. If we could take all our old valuable records out of the various Government buildings in which they are now stored, it would leave a vast quantity of available space for the clerks and the housing of the departments themselves. We have fought for such a proposition, but we have not been able to get it. I hope the Senator will move to send this one item back to conference.

Mr. SMOOT. I gave notice to the conferees that next year I shall, if the Senate will support me in putting the items in an appropriation bill, present them again, and if that is done, it would be a question then as to which vote shall prevail, whether it would be that of the Senate or the House. But I will say to the Senator now that I do not feel like asking it at this time, because this is a short session of Congress and the next session will be a long session, and we shall have more time to thrash the matter out.

Mr. SWANSON. But we have about three weeks more. This has occurred so often that I am getting tired of it. The conferees on the part of the Senate have surrendered so often whenever they have taken a vote in the House that I think it is a good time on this matter to let them understand we are as persistent as they. I had hoped that the Senator from Utah, after the splendid presentation of the matter which he has made in such a determined manner, would move to insist on the amendment and let it go back to conference once more.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I am sure, although the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] did not mention it, that if he were asked he would state that his fellow conferees on the part of the Senate were in full sympathy and accord with him, and it was only after his consent was given that the report was made. I feel that he is not casting the blame on his fellow conferees on the part of the Senate. But on the part of the House it is to be remembered, as the Senator has stated, that when the conference report was made on the House side there was a very unusual attack made upon it by the gentleman who was in charge of the conference report. The surrender on the part of the Senate when made was under protest, and while it is true the Senator from Utah refrained from signing the report, and I do not blame him for that, yet it was entirely with his sympathy that it was signed by his fellow conferees and the report was presented to the Senate.

The Senator from Utah has said that this is the short session of Congress, which is true. We are also lamed somewhat by the fact that we did not prepare beforehand to have these items come down in the regular way through the Budget Bureau and have them taken up through the House, so the House could have the privilege of presenting them. The gentlemen on the House side are somewhat sensitive about supplemental estimates that come in through the Senate, and while very properly the Senator from Utah, the chairman of the Public Buildings Commission, should be looking after the particular business of storage of documents, yet when before the House the matter could be put in the way it was, that we had proceeded in a somewhat crosscut way.

I think I have in my career in this body every time the matter has been brought up committed myself to the preservation of the Government records. I remember, when I was ranking member on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, that we bought a block of ground and paid for it for the purpose of erecting a records building. It was afterwards taken away from us and a building for the Interior Department was erected upon the site, and it is probably the finest office building the Government now owns. I believe we ought to have an archives building, and I believe we ought to have the steel stacks, too. But, as the Senator has so well stated, the House had the opportunity and voted as a House upon it, and it was stated before them that we did not proceed in the way of having estimates made, that there was no estimate for an archives building, and so forth.

So in my judgment we would gain nothing by pursuing this contest further. However, I do not shrink from it at all, but if the conference report should be sent back, I think it would be fruitless and in the long run we would lose rather than gain ground.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moses in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

PURCHASE OF GRAIN FOR SEED PURPOSES.

Mr. CURTIS. I submit a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent to present a concurrent resolution, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2023) defining the crop failure in the production of wheat, rye, or oats by those who borrowed money from the Government of the United States for the purchase of wheat, rye, or oats for seed, and for other purposes, to correct an error therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution. Is there objection?

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

CHARLES RIVER BRIDGE, MASS.

Mr. CALDER. Out of order, from the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 13760) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of drawless bridges across a certain portion of the Charles River, in the State of Massachusetts," approved November 14, 1921. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act to authorize the construction of drawless bridges across a certain portion of Charles River, in the State of Massachusetts, approved November 14, 1921, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Metropolitan Park Commission, or any town or city, or any other public body authorized by the State of Massachusetts, all or any of them, be, and they hereby are, authorized to construct, at any time hereafter, drawless bridges across the Charles River, in the State of Massachusetts, connecting Massachusetts Avenue in Cambridge and Massachusetts Avenue in Boston, and at any other points upon said river at, near, or above said Massachusetts Avenue: *Provided*, That said bridges shall be at least 12 feet above the ordinary level of the water in the basin over the main ship channel, and the piers and other obstructions to the flow of the river shall be constructed in such form and in such places as the Secretary of War shall approve.

"Except as inconsistent herewith, this act shall be subject to the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March 23, 1906."

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, NEAR ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4411) granting the consent of Congress to the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn., or either of them, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in section 17, township 28 north, range 23 west of the fourth principal meridian, in the State of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby granted to the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, or either of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation in the northwest quarter of section 17, township 28 north, range 23 west of the fourth principal meridian, between the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HUMPHREYS CREEK BRIDGE, SPARROWS POINT, MD.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4503) granting the consent of Congress to Bethlehem Steel Co. to construct a bridge across Humphreys Creek at or near the city of Sparrows Point, Md. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Bethlehem Steel Co., and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Humphreys Creek at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or

near the city of Sparrows Point, the county of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RED RIVER BRIDGE BETWEEN TEXAS AND OKLAHOMA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4235) granting consent of Congress to the Charlie Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across Red River between Clay County, Tex., and Cotton County, Okla., and I submit a report (No. 1134) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Charlie Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Red River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between Clay County, Tex., and Cotton County, Okla., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably Senate Resolution 428, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 428) submitted by Mr. POINDEXTER January 30, 1923, was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-seventh Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

WILLIAM O. DOHERTY.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 430. The resolution proposes to pay one year's salary to the heir of Edward W. Doherty, who was a messenger employed by the Senate for a period of 35 years. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 430) submitted by Mr. LODGE February 2, 1923, was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to William O. Doherty, son of Edward W. Doherty, late a messenger acting as assistant doorkeeper of the Senate, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

WORLD WAR FOREIGN-DEBT SETTLEMENT.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask unanimous consent to report back favorably, with an amendment, from the Committee on Finance, House bill 14254, to amend the act entitled "An act to create a commission authorized under certain conditions to refund or convert obligations of foreign governments held by the United States of America, and for other purposes," approved February 9, 1922, and I submit a report (No. 1130) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and placed on the calendar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator when he expects to have that bill considered?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not suppose we can have an opportunity to consider it before Tuesday; possibly not by then; but I hope we shall be able to take it up by that time.

THE MERCHANT MARINE—PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am going to present a unanimous-consent proposal which I intend to submit to the Senate on Monday next. I do not want it understood that it is being presented because of any idea I have with reference to any undue delay upon the shipping bill. I am presenting it merely because I want to do what I can to expedite

the business of the Senate. There are several very important bills which ought to be passed before this session of Congress closes. Those bills, in my judgment, can be passed with the proper discussion if the Senate deals with them promptly.

I further wish to say that it is my desire to avoid, if possible, night sessions. I know what night sessions mean to the Senate and to Senators, especially at this time of the year, and I want to do what I can to avoid them. I want also to do what I can to expedite the business of the Senate. So, Mr. President, I ask that the Secretary may read the unanimous-consent proposal, which I will ask may lie on the table, and I will then call it up on next Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSES in the chair). The Senator from Washington gives notice that on Monday next he will ask unanimous consent that the agreement be entered into, which the Secretary will read for the information of the Senate.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that on and after Friday, February 16, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 60 minutes on the shipping bill, or more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on any amendment pending or that may be offered to said bill; and that on and after Tuesday, February 20, if said bill is not sooner disposed of, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on said bill or more than once nor longer than 5 minutes on any amendment that may be pending or that may be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the request of the Senator from Washington, the proposed unanimous-consent agreement will lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE HENRY Z. OSBORNE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolutions (H. Res. 518) were read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 9, 1923.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HENRY Z. OSBORNE, a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk and ask for their adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 436) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. HENRY Z. OSBORNE, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Monday, February 12, 1923, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of February 5), 1923.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Morris A. Soper, of Maryland, to be United States district judge, district of Maryland, vice John C. Rose, promoted to circuit judge.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10, (legislative day of February 5), 1923.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.
Maj. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder to be ambassador extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Cuba.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Mrs. Eva A. Brittain to be register of the land office at Leadville, Colo.

Elsie K. Fritts to be register of the land office at Water-ville, Wash.

Frank P. Light to be register of the land office at Lakeview, Oreg.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Tyler M. Swann, Roanoke.
John R. Harris, Wadley.

ALASKA.

Martin J. Martin, Nenana.

CONNECTICUT.

Norman C. Kruer, Shelton.

GEORGIA.

Charles R. Jones, Rossville.

ILLINOIS.

Merle C. Champion, Byron.
Jacob M. Tindall, Chester.
Thomas F. Olsen, De Kalb.
Bertie D. Yeazel, Fairmount.
Charles T. Gilkerson, Marengo.
Walter W. Ward, Maroa.
Edgar B. Walters, Oblong.

MARYLAND.

Beatryce B. Bounds, Fruitland.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Nathaniel P. Coleman, Hyannis.

MISSOURI.

Henry L. Windler, Barnett.
James S. Miller, Bloomfield.
Harry E. Carel, Blue Springs.
Ethel N. Hudson, Clever.
Margaret C. Lester, Desloge.
George W. Gasche, Hillsboro.
John F. Hull, Maryville.
Roy R. Quinn, Moberly.
Andrew L. Woods, Naylor.
Cyrus R. Truitt, Novinger.
Ben. B. Smith, Potosi.
Arthur T. King, Warrensburg.

NEW JERSEY.

Horace E. Richardson, Cape May Court House.
Charles G. Wittreich, Chatham.
Richard Watt, Garwood.
Lewis E. Matteson, Grantwood.
Thomas J. Raber, Hampton.
James T. Steel, Little Falls.
Wilbert F. Branin, Medford.
Richard Lufburrow, Middletown.
George F. Moore, Oradell.
Frederick C. Docker, Oxford.
George C. Reed, Park Ridge.
J. Hosey Osborn, Passaic.
Stanley B. Van Iderstine, South Orange.
Hammond S. Ireland, Williamstown.

NEW YORK.

Harry F. House, Chester.
Henry W. Roberts, Clinton.
Mary H. Avery, Elmsford.
Adolph N. Johnson, Falconer.
William D. Creighton, Fort Covington.
Oby J. Hoag, Greene.
Joseph Ogle, Greenport.
Benjamin F. King, Madrid.
Burton E. McGee, Norfolk.
William S. White, Oriskany.
Besse R. Griffin, Quogue.
Fred C. Smith, Vernon.
George M. Lewis, Whitesville.
Albert A. Patterson, Willsboro.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Harry H. Wilson, Blairsville.
Wade M. Henderson, Brookville.
William L. Gouger, Danville.
Anthen C. Messinger, Tatamy.
William Evans, Westgrove.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Charles E. Colman, Curtin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 10, 1923.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Again O Lord Thou hast remembered us in our low estate. Thy mercies are showered upon us in crowded succession. May a sense of the eternal goodness compel us to silence and to confession. In wonder and in gratitude we thank Thee. We would cherish, Holy Spirit, the greatest of gifts, which is an honest and a contrite heart. Impart a force to our wills and a warmth to our hearts that shall more than compensate for our defects and excesses. Do Thou greatly enrich our country. Bless it abundantly with the spirit of good will, with zealous philanthropic efforts, with high ideals, with an earnest sensitive conscience, with a deep reverence for God, and with a charity for all men. In the name of Jesus our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on the Executive Office and independent offices appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend for a moment in order to take up one or two little matters?

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 12887. An act granting a pension to Jacob F. Rosenberger;

H. R. 6204. An act to grant the military target range of Lincoln County, Okla., to the city of Chandler, Okla., and reserving the right to use for military and aviation purposes; and

H. R. 11389. An act for the relief of Robert Guy Robinson.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 13793) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4468. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the settling of New Netherlands, the Middle States, in 1624, by Walloons, French and Belgian Huguenots, under the Dutch West India Co.

S. 4197. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to certain persons and certain corporations permits to explore or leases of certain lands that lie south of the medial line of the main channel of Red River, in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below.

S. 4468. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the settling of New Netherlands, the Middle States, in 1624, by Walloons, French and Belgian Huguenots, under the Dutch West India Co.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

S. 4197. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to certain persons and certain corporations permits to explore or leases of certain lands that lie south of the medial line of the main channel of Red River, in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

LANDS IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask to call up the bill H. R. 5224 with Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks to call up the House bill with Senate amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 5224. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to certify the Secretary of the Interior for restoration to the public domain lands in the State of Louisiana not needed for naval purposes.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing an address I made last week before the Economic Club in New York on law enforcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN PHILIP HILL, BEFORE THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK, HOTEL ASTOR, THURSDAY EVENING, JANUARY 25, ON THE SUBJECT "THE VOLSTEAD ACT AND ENFORCEMENT OF PROHIBITION."

Kipling tells us that in the twilight of the Magic Jungle, in a sort of singsong to little Mowgli, old Baloo recited—

"As the creeper that girdles the tree trunk,
The law runneth forward and back."

It may not be amiss for me to say as a preface to my remarks that in 1916, before any one of us ordinary mortals dreamed of the possibility of the eighteenth amendment, using this little verse as a text, I called attention to the fact that in antitrust prosecutions, in the crusade against the white slaver, in the enforcement of pure food laws, in interstate commerce cases, in the suppression of fraudulent use of the mails, the power of the Attorney General runs forward and back throughout all the States of this great Union, and the activities of the Department of Justice wipe out State lines and from year to year increase the power of the Federal Government and its Executive, of whose growth they are the most striking illustration.

The eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act have gone farther into the personal life of the individual citizen than any previous growth of Federal power, and to-day, when constitutional amendments are being seriously suggested providing that the Federal Government shall extend its control to domestic relations—that is to say, to marriage and divorce and also to child labor—directly in the States, the great questions behind the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act become of vital and immediate importance.

The subject for discussion to-night is "The Volstead Act and the enforcement of prohibition."

This subject contains three specific and independent topics—

(1) Prohibition as declared by the eighteenth amendment, (2) enforcement of this prohibition, and (3) the Volstead Act as a method of enforcement.

The Volstead Act is one of many possible efforts at enforcement, but enforcement itself is the sole method of making the prohibition of the eighteenth amendment effective. Therefore, unless we agree to put the eighteenth amendment in the same ineffective class as the fourteenth amendment, we must have some form of enforcement, but we need not adhere to that method offered by the Volstead Act.

I propose for your consideration the following substitute for the Volstead Act:

Repeat the Volstead Act and enact the following:

"Sec. 1. Each State shall for itself define the meaning of the words 'Intoxicating liquors' as used in section 1 of Article XVIII of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and each State shall itself enforce within its own limits its own laws on this subject.

"Sec. 2. Any person who transports or causes to be transported into any State any beverage prohibited by such State as being an 'intoxicating liquor' shall be punished by the United States by imprisonment for not more than 10 years or by a fine of not less than \$10,000 nor more than \$100,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

The first section of this proposed enforcement act is based on the theory of local option; the second section is based on the Webb-Kenyon Act, by which the United States guarantees the States from outside interference. The proposed substitute, taken as a whole, permits concurrent action each in their own sphere by the United States and by the individual States to carry out the provisions of the eighteenth amendment.

In 1907 the Anti-Saloon League approved my declaration for local option, made as a candidate for the Maryland Legislature. In 1914 I advised the American Express Co. that the Webb-Kenyon Act was constitutional, and that they should not ship liquor into West Virginia.

The Supreme Court sustained my view, and Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler very ably and successfully argued that view in the Supreme Court in the appeal in the cases of the Clark Distilling Co. against the Western Maryland Railway Co. and the State of West Virginia, and the Clark Distilling Co. against my client, the American Express Co., and the State of West Virginia, which cases were decided in 1917.

I do not expect, however, that Mr. Wheeler will agree with my proposed substitute for the Volstead Act. He will probably say of it what he said at the City Club in Cleveland last October about the proposed amendment to the constitution of Ohio permitting 2.75 beverages, which proposed amendment was afterwards defeated: "Nullification has always been indefensible," said Mr. Wheeler, "but now it is reprehensible. When the doctrine was first invoked in the name of State rights there was an honest doubt concerning its legal application. It was finally settled on more than 100 battle fields in the Civil War, and it has never lifted its head in decent society since then until the outlawed liquor traffic, in the name of concurrent power, attempts to nullify our National Constitution and government of laws."

I offer for consideration this substitute for the Volstead Act, and I shall invite your attention to certain considerations relating to the Volstead Act, to enforcement acts in general, and to the eighteenth amendment itself. I think I can show you that there can be enforcement by concurrent power of the United States and the individual States which will not nullify the eighteenth amendment, and which will be satisfactory to those of us who have not and who never have had any connection with any liquor traffic.

Let us consider, first, the Volstead Act. Before the eighteenth amendment many States had one-half of 1 per cent prohibition laws. These States wanted such laws, and no one seeks to disturb their satisfaction with them. But the Volstead Act imposed this standard on other States that did not want such a law. In the one-half of 1 per cent dry States the Volstead Act was not needed; the State law was sufficient to satisfy their people. In the so-called "wet" States the law has been a failure. It has been a failure because it was based on a misstatement of fact. The Volstead Act declares that an intoxicating liquor is anything containing one-half of 1 per cent or more of alcohol by volume which is fit for beverage use.

This is a legislative lie; but even a legal lie remains untrue in fact. In any community where everybody believes that a lie is the truth, for all practical purposes such a lie becomes the truth, and there is

no need for laws on that subject; but in those communities which know a lie when they see one, the inherent instinct for truth makes enforcement of even a legalized lie impossible.

Beverages containing one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol are not in fact intoxicating, and are therefore not prohibited by the eighteenth amendment. Why, then, is not the Volstead Act an immoral law, seeking to enforce a lie?

I do not ask you to accept my statement on this. I shall give you the testimony of Mr. VOLSTEAD himself, of Federal Prohibition Commissioner Haynes, and of the superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of Maryland that one-half of 1 per cent is not intoxicating, and that therefore the fundamental basis of the Volstead Act is false.

On Friday, June 10, 1921, before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, discussing cider and homemade wine, Representative CANTRILL asked Representative VOLSTEAD the following question: "According to your construction, it was not the intent of Congress that it would be a violation of law if wine was made at home containing one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol?" To this Representative VOLSTEAD replied, "No; my contention is this, that it might contain 1 or 2 or possibly 3 per cent without being intoxicating."

On May 2, 1922, Federal Prohibition Commissioner Haynes wrote me officially "that under the provisions of section 29, title 2, of the Volstead Act cider and other nonintoxicating fruit juices manufactured exclusively for use in the home of the maker are not necessarily limited to less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol, but must be intoxicating in fact to be in violation of the Volstead Act." He also stated that "no specific alcoholic limit had been fixed," and that as at present advised his office was not disposed to take action against the manufacture for use in the home of the maker of cider or other fruit juices "containing not more than 2.75 per cent of alcohol by volume."

I at once, on June 12, 1922, asked him to fix the "specific alcoholic limit" of cider and homemade wine. On June 20, 1922, he declined to do so, and gave as a reason "that Congress has not done so and the courts have not as yet definitely settled the question."

After some more correspondence, on July 3, 1922, Mr. Haynes wrote me that his statement of May 2 was a "misapprehension." Finally I got the Secretary of the Treasury to ask the Attorney General for a ruling as to what "nonintoxicating" meant in section 29, title 2, of the Volstead Act. The Attorney General has not yet rendered an opinion, but these proceedings show that even the Government itself agrees to the falsity of the fundamental one-half of 1 per cent declaration of the Volstead Act.

The superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of Maryland on July 10, 1922, said that any man who owns an apple tree, whether it be in his back yard in the city or on an extensive farm, can use his apples for cider. Furthermore, he added, he can let it stand and get hard and, should he desire, he can give it to guests in his home. In view of the fact, vouched for by the Secretary of Agriculture that hard cider contains 6 per cent of alcohol, we have Mr. VOLSTEAD, Mr. Haynes, and the superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of Maryland agreeing that the fundamental statement of the Volstead Act, that beverages containing one-half of 1 per cent are intoxicating, is not true. So the Volstead Act being based on untruth can not prevail. I charge that being based on untruth it is a failure, and again I do not ask you to take my own statement. The President, as well as the most ardent prohibitionists, admit that to-day it is a failure.

On December 8, 1922, the President said to Congress, "There are conditions relating to the enforcement of prohibition which savor of nation-wide scandal. It is the most demoralizing factor in our public life." The President also referred to "men who are rending the moral fiber of the Republic through easy contempt for the prohibition laws." I admit a contempt for the Volstead Act, and I do not hesitate to admit it. I stand on the principle "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." The Volstead Act is based on a lie, and it can not stand. It ought not to stand. There can be no respect for laws of this kind.

That the Volstead Act is a failure is attested by Representative UPSHAW, of Georgia, who has exhorted the governors of the States, led by the President and Vice President of the United States and all the members of the Cabinet and followed by every Member of Congress and by every United States Senator, to declare that they will never again build up a bootleggers' barbarous business by drinking illicit liquor. If Representative UPSHAW did not have proof that the personal actions of these high officials showed they considered the Volstead Act a failure, he would not have asked them to stop their wicked deeds.

Again Representative CRAMTON, of Michigan, on January 18, 1923, in the House referred to the "activities of rum smuggling along the Atlantic coast" and said: "The extent to which the smuggling trade in liquor, narcotics, and aliens has recently grown is sufficient to challenge the consideration of every thoughtful citizen." He then added, "the report of actual seizures made by the enforcement officers shows the amazing growth of this trade."

I believe Mr. UPSHAW and Mr. CRAMTON to be sincere personal and political supporters of the Volstead Act, but I think their charges prove it is a failure.

If the Volstead Act can not stand, what shall be done to enforce the eighteenth amendment? Let us consider for a moment enforcement of other constitutional amendments.

The fourteenth amendment is not enforced and nobody is attempting to enforce it, but that is not the only amendment that is openly nullified. The medical beer bill, or Volstead Act, Junior, deliberately ignores certain guaranties of the Constitution. Section 6 of this act provides punishment for any prohibition enforcement agent or other person who shall search a dwelling without a warrant, but your or my automobile may be stopped on a lonely road at night and your wife or mine may be searched by prohibition agents in violation of the fourth amendment which says "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated." There is no law to protect the persons, papers, and effects of the people, but we do not hear from those who framed the Volstead Act that the fourth amendment is nullified.

Again, the theory of the fifth amendment against double jeopardy has always been taken to mean that people shall not be tried and punished once by the State and again by the United States for one and the same offense. Yet we find no outcry from those who claim to cherish so highly constitutional rights when the Supreme Court very correctly declares in *United States v. Lanza* that the United States and the States each have their separate systems of law, and that Bill, the bootlegger, can get a year in a New York jail and another year in a Federal jail for selling a high official the same one bottle of moonshine at one time in one place.

Again, the guaranty of the sixth amendment is that "in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by jury." The United States courts are crowded with Volstead Act cases that have not been speedily tried, many of them having been on the docket over two years. Yet those who oppose what they call "nullification" of the Constitution make no complaint, but try to substitute trial by injunction for trial by jury under the Volstead Act.

The assistant superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of Maryland said, on June 20, 1922: "A great deal of nonsense has been uttered from time to time about the sacred right of a citizen to be tried by a jury of his peers." He then added that "in nine cases out of ten a judge can pass with more certainty upon cases than a jury of 12 men, some of whom," said he, "at least are likely to be ignorant, if not prejudiced." He then complained that "jurors often forget their oath on account of their sympathy for the offender and refuse to turn in a verdict when the case clearly shows the guilt of the accused." The purpose of the sixth amendment was to guarantee that 12 jurors and not 1 judge should decide the guilt of American citizens; but we do not hear those who believe in the Volstead Act charging that such statements attempt to nullify the Constitution.

And, finally, the fourteenth amendment. Section 19 of the Penal Code of the United States penalizes those who conspire to violate the guaranties of the fourteenth amendment. In 1911, as United States attorney for Maryland, I convicted the supervisors of elections of a county for conspiring to disfranchise colored citizens, proving that the fourteenth amendment has been and could be enforced if the sentiment of the people in the States where it is violated desires it enforced, yet we do not hear those who are back of the Volstead Act insisting on enforcement of the fourteenth amendment or raising the cry of nullification of the Constitution.

Constitutions are declarations of principles, supposed to be fundamental and permanent. Enforcement laws are intended to carry out the spirit of the constitutional principles.

We have seen that the interpretation of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and fourteenth amendments can be liberal, and at times enforcement, as in the fourth and the fourteenth amendments, totally lacking. Therefore, why should we not apply a liberal interpretation to the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment?

The Volstead Act is based on a misstatement of fact. It should be repealed, and a true standard applied to decide what are intoxicating beverages. Under the law I suggest the States could not say constitutionally that 49 per cent whisky is not "intoxicating," but they could say that 2.75 per cent beer, or beer and light wines of a higher alcoholic content are not "intoxicating," and the Supreme Court would say, as it did of the one-half of 1 per cent declaration of Congress, that a State's declaration to this effect is not improper.

In closing let me say one word in general on law enforcement by the Nation and the States. The Constitution does not provide the details of the Federal judicial system. The judiciary bill, debated in the Senate in July, 1789, did this. This bill, which was prepared by a committee of which Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, a great lover of freedom, was a member, was bitterly opposed by some of the Members of the Senate. "I opposed this bill from the beginning," wrote Senator Maclay, of Pennsylvania; "it certainly is a vile law system, calculated for expense and with a design to draw by degrees all law business into the Federal courts. The Constitution is meant to swallow all the State constitutions by degrees, and thus to swallow by degrees all the State judiciaries."

We who stand for the old theory of the Nation and the States feel that in order to enforce the Volstead Act, as Senator Lodge once said, 500,000 spies would be necessary.

We stand to-day at the parting of the ways. Shall we provide 500,000 spies in an attempt to enforce an immoral law, a law based on a legislative lie, or shall we leave enforcement to the States by reasonable State laws which conform to the practices and desires of their people? Personally, I am for a more liberal interpretation of the eighteenth amendment so as to permit the legal sale of wine and beer in those States which want them.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I invite the attention of Congress to the inclosed report from the Secretary of State recommending legislation by Congress which will enable him, as agent of the Government of the United States, to convey to the municipality of Santiago, Chile, the title to and interest in a certain portion of that parcel of land on which the American Embassy in the city of Santiago is situated, and to acquire with the proceeds thereof or to receive in exchange therefor title to a parcel of land adjoining another part of the embassy land, in order to enable the city of Santiago to carry out its project for the construction of a new street.

It will be observed that the American ambassador at Santiago is of the opinion that the proposed transaction would be advantageous to the United States, and that the Secretary of State holds the view that the exchange should be authorized as an evidence of our friendly desire to gratify the wish of the municipality of Santiago to improve and beautify the city. Agreeing with both, I request favorable consideration by Congress of the draft of proposed legislation submitted by the Secretary of State.

WARREN G. HARDING.

(Inclosure: Report from the Secretary of State.)

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 9, 1923.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONFERENCE REPORT, EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on the Executive Office and independent offices appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13696) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and other offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13696) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 10 and 25.

WILL R. WOOD,
L. J. DICKINSON,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
WM. J. HARRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13696) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On No. 10: Strikes out the language inserted by the Senate making an appropriation of \$99,185 for the improvement of the grounds and approaches, parking, retaining walls, etc., for the Perry Victory Memorial.

On No. 25: Strikes out the language inserted by the Senate making an appropriation of \$1,000,000, immediately available, for the installation of 15 stories of filing stacks in the interior court of the Pension Office Building.

WILL R. WOOD,
L. J. DICKINSON,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the conference report be concurred in.

The question was taken, and the conference report was adopted.

ARBITRATION OF NORWEGIAN CLAIM.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 440, Rept. 1574) to satisfy the award rendered against the United States by the arbitral tribunal established under the special agreement concluded June 30, 1921, between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Norway.

Resolved, etc., That the appropriation of \$50,000,000 for the payment of claims by the United States Shipping Board contained in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes," approved June 12, 1922, is made available to the extent required to enable the Secretary of State to satisfy the award rendered against the United States on October 13, 1922, by the arbitral tribunal established under the special agreement concluded June 30, 1921, between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Norway. And the Secretary of State is authorized to withhold from the total amount awarded the sum of \$22,800 with interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from October 13, 1922, to the date of payment of the award, and to pay the claim of Page Brothers, American citizens, in accordance with the decision of the arbitral tribunal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. With the understanding that the gentleman is going to give time as agreed upon, I shall not object; otherwise I would.

Mr. MADDEN. That is all right.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much time will it take?

Mr. MADDEN. Not over 15 minutes.

Mr. SNELL. If it is going to take all the afternoon, I shall object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say in explanation of this resolution that in about 1915, and later in 1916 and 1917, just before the outbreak of the war, the President of the United States issued a proclamation declaring an emergency existing, and under that proclamation the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation commandeered all the shipyards of the United States and all the ships under construction for nationals of foreign governments. It happened that many of those ships under construction were being constructed for nationals of Norway, and they had paid toward the construction costs about \$2,600,000 at the time the requisition of the yards was completed. The Government of the United States continued to complete those ships. They built other ships which were requisitioned from other nationals. No part of the amount advanced for the ship construction by the Norway nationals has ever been returned to them. They made a claim to the Shipping Board, not only for the amount of money they had paid but for the loss sustained by reason of the requisitioning of the ships which were being constructed for them. The claim amounted in all to about \$11,659,000, and with interest to \$16,000,000 and something; without interest, later on they reduced the original claim to \$13,000,000 and something. The question went to the Shipping Board, and an attempt was made between the Shipping Board and the Norway nationals to adjust the differences between the United States and those people. I understand the Shipping Board offered to pay \$2,600,000 and the Norway people refused to accept. They stood on what they originally presented. The final outcome of the difference was an agreement was entered into between Norway and the United States. That agreement was ratified by the Senate. In terms the agreement provided that the President of the United States should appoint one arbiter, the King of Norway appoint another, and those two should name the third, if they could agree; and if they could not agree, then the President of Switzerland was to name the third.

It happened that the duty of naming the third man fell on the President of Switzerland. As organized after the appointment of the third man, the board of arbitration met at The Hague. They took testimony, much of which is submitted in their report, and they found a judgment against the United States for \$11,955,000, with interest at 6 per cent until the time of payment.

The reason why we are here asking unanimous consent for the consideration of this question is that the interest amounts to \$2,000 a day, and every day we delay payment means an additional \$2,000.

Last year the Shipping Board Congress appropriated \$50,000,000, out of which they were authorized to pay any claims that might be adjudicated by the Shipping Board. They have expended out of that \$50,000,000 about \$30,000,000, so that there is a balance of about \$20,000,000 yet on hand; and this being a Shipping Board case, the Committee on Appropriations thought it quite proper to authorize the payment of this award, amounting to \$11,955,000, with interest, out of the unexpended balance of \$50,000,000 then appropriated.

That is all there is to the case. It is a case that we can not avoid. Payment must be made. The award is equivalent to a judgment rendered by the highest court in our own land.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BLANTON. At this hearing at The Hague which was to decide this matter before the members of the board of arbitration our Emergency Fleet Corporation was invited to show, if they could, that they did not get credit from the contractors for \$2,500,000 that Norway had paid on these ships, and it seems strange to me that, so far as the hearings show, they were unable to do it. They could neither show that they did not get credit or that they did; and of course, not being able to show it, the board of arbitration charged them with having received the credit.

The situation is this: The contractors may have the full \$2,500,000.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think so.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman promised to yield me 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois does not control the time. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to make this statement: Of course, this is a claim that must be paid, for it is an arbitration award between our country and Norway and is a treaty obligation, and, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] says, it should be paid at once, for it involves an expense of about \$2,000 for every day of delay.

I have always contended that direct appropriations to take care of claims and other Government activities and operations should be made, but this comes under a different classification. This is a Shipping Board claim, and inasmuch as the Congress has heretofore appropriated \$50,000,000 for the purpose of settling Shipping Board claims, and there will be turned back into the Treasury, according to the statement of Mr. Lasker, something like \$20,000,000 at the beginning of the next fiscal year, I think it is entirely proper that this claim, which is really a Shipping Board claim, should be paid out of that money already appropriated, and which will not be expended in payment of other claims. I am, of course, in favor of the resolution, and I am glad that the gentleman from Illinois has asked unanimous consent in order that it may be passed quickly and thus save enormous expense.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I understood the Speaker to say that I did not control the time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MADDEN. I promised to yield to him.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, of course we are going to have to pay this \$11,955,000, because it is a matter that has been settled by arbitration. I would be the last man in the world to object to paying an honest obligation that has been adjusted by arbitration; but here is what I complain about: This arbitration agreement was entered into without our knowledge or consent by Mr. Hughes, the present Secretary of State, with the Kingdom of Norway, and here is where our Government slipped a cog; here is where our Government did not look out for our interests—the State Department agreed that we would appoint one arbitrator and that the King of Norway would appoint another. And who should be the third?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In one minute.

Mr. MADDEN. I just wanted to say, if the gentleman will yield, that this treaty was ratified by the Senate.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand that; but it was made by Mr. Secretary Hughes in the State Department of the present administration, and it was ratified by the present administration. Now, here is the situation: Who was to be the third arbitrator? The third arbitrator should have been a man who was disinterested and unbiased in the question between the two parties, and a man also who would not only be fair to our country in a conflict with Norway, but who would have no bias in favor of a European nation. But no; they left the third arbitrator undetermined. They decided if our two arbitrators could not agree upon a third, then that the third should be selected by one who would naturally be inclined toward a European nation rather than our own.

It was the opinion of our experts that we should not pay Norway more than \$2,679,220. But this arbitration court, composed of two Europeans and only one American, decided that we should pay Norway \$11,955,000, with interest, and now, of course, we must pay it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to yield first to the gentleman from Illinois, if he wanted to ask me a question; then I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I simply wanted to ask the gentleman what we have to do with that matter, inasmuch as this treaty was regularly made?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not talking about what we have to do with it. We had nothing to do with it. But we have got to pay it. I would not have agreed that the main deciding judge of this matter would be a European, because it is my firm belief that with two Europeans and only one American, the decision will be in favor of the European and against us ninety-nine times out of one hundred.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The treaty-making power and the United States Senate have agreed to it.

Mr. BLANTON. I know; but the State Department did not properly safeguard our interests when it agreed that a European should be the third deciding judge in this matter. It was a matter that our State Department should have safeguarded at that time. No one can object now to this resolution. We must pass it and pay the decree. The State Department acted hon-

estly and in perfect good faith, but it acted very unwisely, and instead of paying back to Norway \$2,500,000 that they had paid on these ships, with reasonable interest, we have now got to pay the stupendous sum of \$11,955,000, with interest, because the two Europeans outvoted one American, and decided that because the United States requisitioned ships in our own shipyards during the war which cost Norway \$2,679,220, that we should now pay Norway not the \$2,679,220 but the stupendous profit of \$11,955,000, notwithstanding that we used those very ships to help save the civilization of the whole world for Norway's benefit.

I say it is just one of those situations where we do not look after matters at the proper time. We do not give these matters proper consideration at the time they ought to be given consideration. There is too much disregard for the rights of the American people, in being kind and considerate to Europeans. There is not enough care and good judgment exercised concerning matters in which the American taxpayer is vitally interested. We are growing into the habit of forgetting Americans to help Europeans. I am just merely voicing the protest here that in the future we ought to look after our own American interests a little more carefully.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I have never thought it was the province of the legislative body to go into matters that would require a quasi judicial determination of facts within the jurisdiction of the executive departments. I have been one of those who believed that the functions of the legislative department and of the executive department were very clearly defined and separated, and that the definition and separation was a wise thing for the good of the Government. The proposition presented by this resolution is, Shall we make good the decision and the action of one of the independent coordinate branches of the Government within its jurisdiction, to wit, the State Department, a part of the executive department? If the department that is charged with the duty of handling these things handles them in good faith and renders its judgment and asks us to make the necessary appropriations to carry out the decisions of the State Department, I feel that we are morally bound to do that, in the absence of fraud or bad faith, and that if we undertake to go behind the findings of the State Department in matters of this kind honestly and in good faith made we make the confusion worse confounded. I not only say to the State Department and to the Executive, "You keep your hands off of legislative matters," but I in turn am willing to say to the legislative department, "You keep your hands off of that which is peculiarly within the province of the executive department, and especially where it involves our foreign affairs." For that reason I shall not undertake to go behind the findings of our State Department. You have got to trust it to a certain extent upon matters of this kind, and unless some gentleman can show bad faith on the part of Secretary Hughes—and I do not believe you can—I believe in backing him up in matters of this kind.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I agree with the gentleman. My whole speech agrees with him. We must now comply with this arbitration decision and pay the bill. But suppose the State Department, under either Democratic or Republican régime, though absolutely honest, makes a foolish agreement, one which means nothing but one kind of a verdict against our country, has not a representative of the people a right to voice the people's protest?

Mr. WINGO. Yes; and I think the time to enter protests was when the foolish act was done.

Mr. BLANTON. We had nothing to do with providing for the arbitration here in the House.

Mr. WINGO. Well, it was known. But, be that as it may, do we know that it was a foolish act? Under the Constitution is it our duty to say whether or not the Secretary of State in handling certain matters that are clearly within his province and his duties, and shall we every time sit in judgment upon his decision when there is no evidence of fraud or neglect of duty? If I think that he is deliberately betraying his trust, then I for one not only will scrutinize very carefully the particular matter in controversy, but from that time on I will scrutinize every matter with which he is concerned. But, however much I may differ in some respects with the present Secretary of State, I do not believe he is going to deliberately betray the interests of the United States. I do not believe he has done it in this instance. I have faith in his integrity. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that in my judgment there was no unwisdom, there was no lack of good judgment in this whole transaction. I see nothing whatever

in it from beginning to end that is a subject for criticism. Here was a controversy between Norway and the United States. Instead of dragging it out, instead of making it a cause of ill will and bad feeling between the two nations, we agreed on an arbitration of settlement. Mr. Speaker, we are, we hope, on the opening of a new era in which international quarrels shall not be settled by war, but either by arbitration as it is now carried on, or by the determination of a great international court where nations, when unable to agree upon a peaceful settlement, may go into court instead of going to war. This, however, was an agreement by arbitration. It was an agreement by which each party selected an arbitrator, and then they were to agree upon a third if they could do so, and if they could not agree upon a third, a person was to be named, impartial, outside of the controversy, to name the third arbitrator. That is the usual custom in disputes which are settled by arbitration. Let me say to my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who criticizes the appointment which was made, that the selection was undoubtedly absolutely fair and impartial. Certainly we should approve this arbitration promptly and gladly, because of the influence that it will have upon future peaceful determinations of international affairs. [Applause.] Besides, Mr. Speaker, we will not acquire credit when we agree only when the decision is favorable to us, but we shall acquire favor when we promptly and without protest acquiesce when the decision is against us.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman from Iowa, who has very sound judgment, contend that in a controversy between the United States and Norway a European country would be absolutely impartial and unbiased?

Mr. TOWNER. I certainly do.

Mr. BLANTON. I would have chosen some other arbitrator.

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly the gentleman can not have any knowledge that would justify him in objecting to an arbitration such as the one we are now considering.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when the Select Committee on the Shipping Board was operating under the authority of this House it went into the matter of the Norwegian claims at some length.

Those claims arose from requisitions made by the Shipping Board of Norwegian vessels and the plants in which vessels were being constructed. Most of the vessels were in course of construction. A controversy arose as to whether or not the requisitions were really requisitions of the plants and of the ships themselves or of the building contracts. The requisitions were made at a time when shipping in the markets of the world was selling at exorbitantly high prices.

Our ships cost on an average of about \$220 per ton. At the time the Norwegian ships were requisitioned some ships were selling in the markets of the world at \$300 per ton, and of course Norway contended that she was entitled to be compensated at the rate that similar ships were bringing in the world markets. The only question ever involved was the measure of damage. The United States admitted liability, and it was only a question of how much we owed Norway. We submitted that matter to arbitration. The arbitrators ruled and made a finding, and of course there is nothing for the United States to do, either from the standpoint of justice and right or from the standpoint of absolute law in this particular case, except to comply with the finding; and I am glad that the United States has brought this controversy to a settlement. I believe it will be an evidence to the world that the United States intends to live up to her obligations and that when she submits a controversy to arbitration or to a court and the judgment goes against us we are just as willing to comply with it as if it went in our favor. [Applause.] I believe that just now, in the disturbed condition of the world, when public credit and public faith—at least in some regions of the world—are not up to the standard that they once enjoyed, this action of the United States will be a distinct contribution to the public integrity and to the spirit of public fair dealing and of international justice, not only here but throughout the whole world. [Applause.]

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to express my disagreement with the view expressed by the able gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO]. We are all in favor of complying with the award. I do not think that anybody has acted in bad faith in the matter. Both the Secretary of State and the Senate have done the wise thing in submitting this matter to arbitration. I take issue with the view expressed by the gentleman from Arkansas that the division of the three powers—legislative, executive, and judicial—is so distinct that the House of Representatives has nothing to do with any question affecting international relations. The very fact that this matter

is before the House contradicts his theory. The House of Representatives controls the purse, and in controlling the purse it controls in a way every other department. It is within the power of the House to refuse to vote any appropriation for the judiciary. It is within the power of the House to refuse to vote an appropriation for salaries or clerks or books for the Supreme Court. It may decline to appropriate moneys for the maintenance of embassies. The body that is vested by the Constitution with the duty of initiating all measures to provide revenue represents the ultimate power which lies in the sovereign people.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman makes no distinction between power and policy?

Mr. LONDON. I do. Let me say to the gentleman from Arkansas, who has stated his position clearly and who knows how to present an argument in unmistakable form, that the Supreme Court on more than one occasion has laid down the policy for the country.

Mr. WINGO. The distinguished gentleman thinks because the judiciary, which is one coordinate branch of the Government, and the executive, another branch, usurped some of our legislative power by declaring the policy that the House of Representatives is justified in invading theirs.

Mr. LONDON. In the very essence of things the House, which consists of Representatives of the people, receiving their mandates at frequent intervals, the body intended to control the finances of the country, the ways and means of raising taxes, should be the principal repository of the power of the Government.

Mr. WINGO. I agree with the gentleman. There is no question but that we have the power to refuse to appropriate the salaries for the judges of the Supreme Court and the salary of the President, but while we have the power is it not our moral duty to make the appropriations?

Mr. LONDON. Take the question of a treaty which calls for an expenditure of money. It is up to the House to provide the appropriation or to decline to do so. But I am contending—in five minutes I can not develop my argument or state it as clearly as perhaps the gentleman from Arkansas would—that in the actual working of the Government the supposed separation between the three departments does not exist, or at least to the extent to which gentlemen claim.

Mr. EVANS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Does the gentleman contend that the House has any more control over appropriations for the Department of State than the Senate had in fixing this matter?

Mr. LONDON. There is no doubt but that the House would have the power to deny the appropriation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has attracted my attention in the observations he has just made. I appreciate the trend of the last 20 or 30 years toward the larger powers in the House of Representatives, but I do not believe that that trend is a wise one, especially if it goes to the destruction of the nice relationship between the coordinate powers of the Government. In other words, I think that our system is the greatest invention to maintain independent action of the coordinate departments so that each one may perform its functions without any interference with the other, and at the same time be in a sense interdependent upon one another. My point is this: That the legislative department is somewhat constructed by the Executive power to veto, and, secondly, by the judiciary with the power to declare a law unconstitutional and therefore null and void. There is some limitation on the legislative power in that regard, and I regard this balance of power a wise provision.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. LONDON. What I was trying to make clear was that the House of Representatives had a voice in the determination of international relations, and that was inevitable because of the proper functioning of the American system of government.

Mr. FESS. I doubt whether that statement is justified. The Senate has something to do with the adjustment of international relations in the degree that it has the treaty power of confirmation. The House only responds to the treaty when an appropriation is required by the treaty. Whether the House of Representatives could refuse to make an appropriation that the treaty involved is an open question, because the treaty is the supreme law of the land, and that is constitutional, and it is a question whether, when the treaty is made, it is not an obli-

gation on the House to meet the requirements of the treaty, and, in fact, history shows that we have always done so.

Mr. WINGO. Both the power and the duty is identical in a case where a treaty to be carried out must have an appropriation, just as in the case where by law a salary is fixed and the service is rendered we have the power to refuse, but it is something that goes to integrity of the body.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman has stated it more clearly than I.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Not for this moment. This is what I am concerned about: In this stage of our cycle of thinking we can not improve upon the plan that we have to-day, which is unlike any other plan in the history of all governments. Let us stand by that wise provision which insures independence of action of all the coordinate departments.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] if he contends that it is within the power of the House of Representatives to destroy our Government?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and myself may have the privilege of extending our remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MADDEN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the House joint resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 13660) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan calls up the conference report upon the District of Columbia appropriation bill and asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13660) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 16, 29, 32, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48, 60, 61, 62, 63, 67, 68, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 90, 92, 93, 97, 107, 109, 110, 111, 113, 119, 122, 128, and 130.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 50, 52, 59, 66, 70, 72, 73, 79, 85, 86, 89, 91, 94, 95, 98, 99, 102, 108, 114, 115, and 125, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$154,180"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and two Ford runabouts of the 'slip-on' body type without self-starter, not exceeding \$550 each; in all, \$3,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore

the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That after April 30, 1923, until the constitutionality of the act creating this board shall have been determined by the Supreme Court of the United States there shall not be expended from this appropriation or from the appropriation for this board for the remainder of the fiscal year 1923 a greater sum than at the rate of \$1,600 per annum for personal services and \$400 per annum for contingent and miscellaneous expenses"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Including an allowance to the secretary of the Board of Charities, not exceeding the rate of \$20 per month, for the maintenance of an automobile to be furnished by him and used in the discharge of his official duties, \$47,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "other than motor vehicles for the police and fire departments, but no such vehicles shall be transferred from the police or fire departments to any other branch of the government of the District of Columbia"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$16,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$573,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$20"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$55,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$20 per month for an automobile, and \$10 per month for a motor cycle"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$20 per month for an automobile, and \$10 per month for a motor cycle"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$20"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "give his whole time from nine o'clock antemeridian to four o'clock postmeridian to, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$240"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "or contracts as in this act provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That none of the money appropriated by this act shall be paid or obligated toward the construction of or addition to any building the whole and entire construction of which, exclusive of heating, lighting, and plumbing, shall not have been awarded in one or a single contract, separate and apart from any other contract, project, or undertaking, to the lowest bidder complying with all the legal requirements as to a deposit of money or the execution of a bond or both, for the faithful performance of the contract: *Provided further*, That no architect's fee shall be paid or obligated for plans, specifications, or any professional services whatever, unless they are such as will enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or those letting a contract, to secure a legal bid within the amount authorized by Congress for the building or other project: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed as repealing existing law giving the commissioners the right to reject all bids"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "The total cost of the sites and of the several and respective buildings herein provided for, including heating, lighting, and plumbing, when completed upon plans and specifications to be made previously and approved, shall not exceed the several and respective sums of money herein respectively appropriated or authorized for such purposes, any provision in this act to the contrary notwithstanding"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$8,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$20"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$325; maintenance of motor vehicle used in performance of official duties, at not to exceed \$20 per month, 240"; and on page 69 of the bill, in line 7, strike out "\$5,137" and insert "\$5,065"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$56,000, and all moneys hereafter received at the reformatory as income thereof from the sale of brooms to the various branches of the government of the District of Columbia shall remain available for the purchase of material for the manufacture of additional brooms to be similarly disposed of; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "136,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: On page 91 of the bill, in line 3, strike out "\$40,000" and in lieu thereof insert "\$45,000"; and on page 91 of the bill, in line 18, strike out "\$8,000" and in lieu thereof insert "\$10,000"; and on page 92 of the bill, in lines 2 and 3, strike out "\$20,000, payable wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia" and in lieu thereof insert "\$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For the preparation of designs and estimates for development of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, \$4,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments numbered 24, 33, 55, 56, 64, 65, 75, 76, 83, 105, 112, 116, 117, 118, 123, 124, 126, 127, and 129.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
ROBERT E. EVANS,
BEN JOHNSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,
WESLEY L. JONES,
L. HEISLER BALL,
CARTER GLASS,
MORRIS SHEPPARD,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13660) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, submit the following statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On Nos. 1 to 12, inclusive, relating to the executive office: Appropriates \$350 for the veterinary division, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$250, as proposed by the House; improves the form of the bill, as proposed by the Senate; fixes the maintenance allowance for privately owned motor cycles at \$10 per month, as proposed by the House, instead of \$13 per month, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates in pursuance thereof \$360, as proposed by the House, instead of \$468, as proposed by the Senate; fixes the maintenance allowance for privately owned automobiles at \$20 per month, as proposed by the House, instead of \$26 per month, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates in pursuance thereof \$1,200, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,560, as proposed by the Senate; improves the form of the bill as proposed by the Senate; fixes the maintenance allowance for privately owned motor cycles at \$10 per month, as proposed by the House, instead of \$13 per month, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates in pursuance thereof \$600, as proposed by the House, instead of \$780, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 13 and 14, relating to the collector's office: Appropriates for four bailiffs, at \$1,200 each, as proposed by the Senate, instead of three bailiffs at the same rate, as proposed by the House.

On No. 15, relating to the municipal architect's office: Appropriates for two instead of four Ford runabouts, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 16: Appropriates \$5,000 for contingent expenses of the Public Utilities Commission, as proposed by the House, instead of \$8,000, as proposed by the Senate, and retains the limitation proposed by the House precluding the employment of special legal services by the commission.

On Nos. 17 and 18, relating to the surveyor's office: Appropriates \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 19: Retains the limitation proposed by the House limiting expenditures by the Minimum Wage Board until the constitutionality of the act creating such board shall have been finally determined as amended so as not to become effective until May 1, 1923.

On Nos. 20 and 21, relating to the Rent Commission: Appropriates \$51,750, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$42,500, as proposed by the House, and increases the sum made available for salaries of members of the commission from \$13,750, proposed by the House, to \$23,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 22 and 23: Appropriates for an additional assistant at \$1,000 per annum for the Southeast Branch Library, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 25 to 32, inclusive, relating to contingent and miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates \$47,500 for contingent and miscellaneous expenses instead of \$45,000, as proposed by the House, and \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes an allowance at the rate of \$20 per month to the secretary of the Board of Charities for supplying for official uses his own automobile, instead of such an allowance at the rate of \$26 per month to said secretary and the purchasing officer of the District besides, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the paragraph proposed by the House requiring, with certain exceptions, all appropriations on account of passenger motor transportation to be pooled; broadens the general provision limiting the cost of automobiles purchased or exchanged, specifically excluding motor vehicles for the police and fire departments, as proposed by the Senate, amended so as to prevent the transfer of motor vehicles acquired by the police and fire departments to other branches of the government of the District of Columbia; strikes out the authorization, proposed by the Senate, for the maintenance of telephones in the residences of three employees of the water department; appropriates \$16,500 for postage instead of \$15,000, as proposed by the House, and \$18,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision proposed by the House with respect to the printing and sale of the pamphlet of taxes in arrears; and makes the provision with respect to compensation for copying instruments and making copies of records in the office of the recorder of deeds permanent law, as proposed by the House, instead of confining its effect to the fiscal year 1924.

On Nos. 34 to 44, inclusive, relating to street improvements: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation proposed by the House for paving Georgia Avenue, Military Road to Dahlia Street; appropriates \$110,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$210,000, as proposed by the House, for paving Bladensburg Road; strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation proposed by the House for paving Canal Road, Aqueduct Bridge to Foxall Road; provides for paving Spring Place, end of pavement to Sixteenth Street, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$11,000 and \$12,600 for paving portions of Kenyon Street and Kansas Avenue, respectively, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriations proposed by the Senate for paving portions of Thirteenth, Buchanan, and Ninth Streets; and restores the appropriation proposed by the House for paving Sigsbee Place NE., Tenth Street to Twelfth Street.

On No. 45: Strikes out the paragraph proposed by the Senate repealing the appropriation made for the fiscal year 1923 for repaving a portion of Fifteenth Street NW.

On No. 46: Authorizes an allowance at the rate of \$20 per month for providing a privately owned automobile for official uses in connection with street repair work, instead of at the rate of \$26 per month, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 47: Strikes out the authorization, proposed by the Senate, for an allowance to the overseer of bridges for supplying an automobile for official uses.

On No. 48: Designates the new bridge crossing the Potomac River at Georgetown as the Francis Scott Key Bridge, as proposed by the House, instead of as the Key Bridge, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 49: Appropriates \$55,000 for trees and parkings instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the House, and \$60,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 50 and 51, relating to street cleaning: Makes the appropriation available for allowances to inspectors for maintenance of motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate, and makes the rate of allowance for an automobile \$20 per month and for a motor cycle \$10 per month instead of \$26 and \$13 per month, respectively, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 52 to 54, inclusive, relating to garbage disposal: Makes the appropriation available for allowances to inspectors for maintenance of motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate; makes the rate of allowance for an automobile \$20 per month and for a motor cycle \$10 per month instead of \$26 and \$13 per month, respectively, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$860,000 instead of \$825,000, as proposed by the House, and \$900,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 57 to 60, inclusive, relating to the electrical department: Provides for an allowance for the maintenance of not more than three privately owned automobiles at not to exceed \$20 per month each instead of \$26 per month each, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$30,000 for general supplies, etc., instead of \$27,500, as proposed by the House, and \$32,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$472,000 for lighting, as

proposed by the Senate, instead of \$450,000, as proposed by the House; and appropriates \$20,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$35,000, as proposed by the Senate, for replacing lighting fixtures.

On Nos. 61 to 63, inclusive, relating to public schools: Appropriates for two assistant superintendents, as proposed by the House, instead of three assistant superintendents, one to have charge of business affairs, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 66: Appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$40,000, as proposed by the House, for allowance to principals of grade school buildings.

On No. 67: Appropriates \$6,480 for Americanization work, as proposed by the House, instead of \$9,980, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 68: Provides that the appropriation on account of community-center activities shall be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House.

On No. 69: Requires that the chief medical and sanitary inspector of the public schools shall give his whole time from 9 o'clock a. m. to 4 o'clock p. m. to his duties, instead of his "whole time," as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 70 to 73, inclusive, relating to miscellaneous expenses of the public schools: Appropriates \$3,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,000, as proposed by the House, for transportation of tubercular pupils; provides for an allowance for maintenance to be paid to nine officers and employees of the public schools for providing their own automobiles for official uses at the rate of \$240 per annum, instead of \$312 per annum, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$6,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,500, as proposed by the House, for purchase of apparatus; and provides, as proposed by the Senate, that children of employees of the United States stationed outside of the District of Columbia shall be admitted to the public schools without payment of tuition.

On No. 74: Provides in connection with the appropriation for remodeling and constructing an addition to the Western High School that one or more contracts may be entered into, as proposed by the Senate, subject to the restrictions elsewhere proposed in the bill.

On Nos. 77 to 82, inclusive, relating to sites for school purposes: Strikes out the appropriation of \$15,000 proposed by the Senate for the purchase of land adjoining the Ludlow School; strikes out the appropriation of \$50,000 proposed by the Senate for the purchase of a site on which to locate a junior high school north of Lincoln Park; appropriates \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of land adjoining the Dunbar High School; strikes out the appropriation of \$20,000 proposed by the Senate for the purchase of a site near the Brightwood School; strikes out the appropriation of \$30,000 proposed by the Senate for the purchase of a site near Rittenhouse and Fifth Streets NW., and strikes out the appropriation proposed by the Senate of \$45,000 for the purchase of a site north of Webster Street and east of Georgia Avenue.

On No. 84: Restores the matter proposed by the House with respect to building contracts and architects' fees, amended so as to permit separate contracts being entered into for heating, lighting, and plumbing.

On No. 85: Appropriates \$300,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$250,000, as proposed by the House, for repairs and improvements to school buildings and grounds, etc.

On No. 86: Provides that the appropriations contained in the bill for the purchase of land for school purposes shall be available immediately, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 87: Restores the matter proposed by the House requiring that the total cost of sites and buildings shall respectively come within the respective appropriations, amended so as to include specifically the cost of heating, lighting, and plumbing, and to supersede any contrary provision.

On Nos. 88 to 91, inclusive, relating to the police department: Appropriates \$8,500 for fuel, instead of \$7,000, as proposed by the House, and \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$35,000 on account of the maintenance and replacement of motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000, as proposed by the House; strikes out the appropriation of \$2,500 proposed by the Senate for marking traffic lines for cross walks at street intersections; and appropriates \$3,500 for fuel, and so forth, harbor patrol, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 92: Appropriates \$4,500 for forage, fire department, as proposed by the House, instead of \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 93 to 99, inclusive, relating to the health department: Appropriates \$6,000 for maintenance of disinfecting service, as proposed by the House, instead of \$6,500, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$750 on account of the bacteriological

laboratory, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$650, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$1,000 on account of the chemical laboratory, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$750, as proposed by the House; provides for an allowance for supplying privately owned automobiles for official uses at the rate of not to exceed \$20 per month instead of \$26 per month, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$6,000 on account of dairy-farm inspection, as proposed by the House, instead of \$8,000, as proposed by the Senate, striking out the authorization proposed by the Senate extending the availability of the appropriation for traveling expenses; appropriates \$250 for the dog pound, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$18,000 on account of the child-hygiene service, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 100: Provides for an allowance for the maintenance of a privately owned automobile used for official purposes, as proposed by the Senate, fixing the rate, however, at \$20 per month instead of \$26 per month, and in consequence thereof makes the appropriation on account of the probation system of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia \$5,065 instead of \$5,137, as proposed by the House and Senate.

On No. 101: Appropriates \$1,700 on account of maintenance of motor ambulances under the Board of Charities, instead of \$1,600, as proposed by the House, and \$1,800, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 102: Appropriates \$4,750 for screening at the jail, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,500, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 103 and 104, relating to the reformatory: Appropriates \$56,000 for maintenance, etc., instead of \$52,000, as proposed by the House, and \$60,000, as proposed by the Senate; and restores the authorization proposed by the House to employ the income from the sale of brooms for producing additional brooms, amended so as to limit the application of such receipts to the purchase of broom material only.

On No. 106: Appropriates \$10,000 for indigent patients cared for at the Eastern Dispensary and Casualty Hospital, instead of \$5,000, as proposed by the House, and \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 107: Strikes out the authorization, proposed by the Senate, to receive pay patients at the Tuberculosis Hospital.

On Nos. 108 and 109, relating to the Gallinger Municipal Hospital: Appropriates \$5,000 for repairs to buildings, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,000, as proposed by the House; and strikes out the authorization, proposed by the Senate, to receive pay patients in the psychopathic ward.

On Nos. 110 and 111: Strikes out the two additional placing and investigating officers at \$1,000 each under the Board of Children's Guardians, proposed by the Senate.

On No. 113: Appropriates \$5,000 on account of a cottage for boys at the Industrial Home School for Colored Children, as proposed by the House, instead of \$7,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 114 and 115: Appropriates for an additional cook at \$180 per annum under the Home for Aged and Infirm, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 119: Restores the appropriation of \$31,200, proposed by the House, for salaries of foremen, gardeners, etc., under the office of public buildings and grounds.

On No. 120: Restores the 32 separate appropriation paragraphs proposed by the House for the improvement and care of public grounds in the District of Columbia instead of providing for same in four appropriation paragraphs, as proposed by the Senate, amended so as to increase the amount proposed by the House for improvement, care, and maintenance of various reservations from \$40,000 to \$45,000, and the amount for oiling and otherwise treating macadam roads from \$8,000 to \$10,000, and so as to reduce the amount proposed by the House for placing and maintaining special portions of the parks in condition for outdoor sports from \$20,000 to \$15,000, and making such appropriation chargeable 40 per cent to the United States and 60 per cent to the District of Columbia, instead of wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, so that the restored paragraphs provide in the aggregate for \$2,000 more than proposed by the House and \$10,000 less than proposed by the Senate in the four substitute paragraphs proposed by the Senate.

On No. 121: Appropriates \$4,000 for the preparation of designs and estimates for development of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, instead of for the commencement of the preparation of such designs and estimates, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 122: Strikes out the appropriation of \$50,000 proposed by the Senate for continuing the construction of a sea wall.

On No. 125: Appropriates \$37,000 for lighting the public grounds, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$24,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 128: Strikes out the authorization and appropriation proposed by the Senate in connection with a restudy of the highway system of the District of Columbia.

On No. 130: Fixes the allowance to be paid for the maintenance of privately owned motor cycles used for official purposes at \$10 per month, as proposed by the House, instead of \$13 per month, as proposed by the Senate.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On No. 24, relating to the Mount Pleasant Branch Library.

On No. 33, relating to the erection of accommodations for the office of the recorder of deeds and other activities of the District government.

On Nos. 55 and 56, relating to the purchase of sites for playgrounds.

On Nos. 64 and 65, relating to administrative principals of elementary schools.

On Nos. 75, 76, and 83, relating to the purchase of sites for school purposes and to the erection of school buildings.

On No. 105, relating to the purchase of a site and the erection of buildings thereon for the accommodation of girls committed to the National Training School for Girls.

On No. 112, relating to a home and school for feeble-minded persons.

On No. 116, relating to an appropriation for aid and support of the National Library for the Blind.

On No. 117, relating to an appropriation to aid the Columbia Polytechnic Institute for the Blind.

On No. 118, relating to a modification of the existing project for Anacostia Park above Benning Bridge.

On No. 123, relating to an appropriation for the construction of a comfort station and shelter at Haines Point, East Potomac Park.

On No. 124, relating to the appropriation for the construction of a bathing beach and bathhouse for the colored population of the District of Columbia.

On No. 126, relating to the areas to comprise the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway and to the protection of Rock Creek and its tributaries.

On No. 127, relating to the acquisition of the tract known as the Klinge Valley Park, the Piney Branch Valley Park, and a portion of the tract known as the Patterson tract.

On No. 129, relating to the appropriation for increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
ROBERT E. EVANS,
BEN JOHNSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CRAMTON rose.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 13793) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas a question or two. The Senate has placed on this bill an amendment which is intended to prevent any violation of the service pay bill by permitting officers in the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps from getting allowances in kind in addition to the \$20 per month rental allowance. Is it the gentleman's purpose to look with favor upon that amendment?

Mr. ANTHONY. I would say to the gentleman that my attitude personally would rather favor an amendment of that kind, but I would not like to bind the conferees in advance of a discussion of the matter.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman, however, before agreeing that that amendment might be stricken out would possibly give the House an opportunity of expressing itself?

Mr. ANTHONY. Undoubtedly, I think the gentleman will find that the House conferees will desire to consult the wishes of the House as largely as possible on any disputed question in the conference.

Mr. McKENZIE. One other matter. The Senate has placed an amendment on the bill which provides for the retirement of certain officers with higher grades, and changes the law which is now in existence—that is, the Army reorganization law—and would permit not only taking these men from the eligible list, as provided for in the Army reorganization bill, but going down into the grade of major and promoting majors to some higher grade, such as brigadier general. Before the Committee on Military Affairs there is pending now a bill, introduced by the gentleman from Kansas himself, covering some of those points. It is a very important bill. We have not had time to consider it, and I certainly feel that it would be a mistake to undertake to legislate changes in the Army reorganization act in this manner; and I hope that the gentleman will not consent to that amendment without giving the House an opportunity to pass upon it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman has expressed his intention with reference to some of these amendments. Was the gentleman's attention called to an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois in the committee when the bill was under consideration here, providing that no part of the funds should be used until certain captains were promoted?

Mr. ANTHONY. I understand the Senate has amplified the amendment adopted by the House—has further perfected it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The Senate committee struck it all out.

Mr. ANTHONY. It was restored, as I understand, by an amendment offered from the floor of the Senate. I am talking about the Hull amendment.

Mr. HULL. That is in satisfactory shape.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I thought it was offered by the gentleman from Illinois. What is the gentleman's purpose with reference to the amendment the House adopted regarding enlistments from 18 to 21 years of age?

Mr. ANTHONY. I would be unable to tell the gentleman what the sentiment of the conferees would be. Personally I look upon that amendment as unwise. I can not speak for my colleagues.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman realizes that that amendment was adopted by the House and put on the bill. Would he disregard the action of the House?

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, no; I think not. I think the gentleman will find that the conferees will desire to consult the wishes of the House on all important things of that kind where the House has expressed itself. There is no intent on the part of the conferees to go against the wishes of the House.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Could the gentleman assure us that the conferees will bring that amendment back to the House for a vote before the matter is settled?

Mr. ANTHONY. I doubt if I could assure the gentleman of that, because I am unable to give him the attitude of the other conferees.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Would that be the attitude of the gentleman?

Mr. ANTHONY. I told the gentleman that I personally was opposed to that amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman also said that, while he was opposed to it, he was disposed to consult the wishes of the House.

Mr. ANTHONY. Absolutely.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does he mean by that that he would be willing to bring it back to the House again for a vote?

Mr. ANTHONY. Ordinarily on any amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am talking about this particular amendment only, not ordinarily.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not believe the gentleman would want me to promise in advance what the action of the conferees would be.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. No. I was trying to get the gentleman's attitude.

Mr. ANTHONY. If it comes to a vote of the conferees, personally I shall vote against such an amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Against bringing it back to the House?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. How can we have a conference if everybody goes to it hog tied?

Mr. ANTHONY. We would not have much of a conference in that event. I think the gentleman can be assured that he will undoubtedly have an opportunity to have the matter considered.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, would not this be the time to make a motion to instruct the conferees?

The SPEAKER. The time for instructing the conferees is after the bill has been ordered to conference.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman—my understanding is the amendment affecting the retired pay of officers connected with corporations, and so forth, selling to the Government has been stricken out by the Senate.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is my understanding.

Mr. DICKINSON. It is my hope we will have an opportunity to vote on that amendment, which was adopted by the House, or in some modified terms whereby retired officers are prevented from becoming sales agents, and so forth, and prevented from selling materials as officers of corporations to the respective services from which they have been retired. I would like to know whether or not the conferees will be disposed to bring that back to the House for some decision?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman, just the same as I said to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], on any proposition that comes up where a considerable number of Members of the House are interested, I think the disposition of the conferees will be to bring it back to the House for consideration.

Mr. DICKINSON. I would like to suggest to the gentleman it seems to me the honor of the Members of the House is at stake here when our decision here is given such wide publicity, and so forth; I think that we ought to have a chance to show to the country we are in sincere faith here in adopting this policy.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think I can assure the House there will be no disposition to foreclose on this amendment or any others.

Mr. McSWAIN. Bearing in mind the fact the gentleman said he would be disposed to bring back for consultation of the House any important matter that a considerable number of Members express interest in, I desire to say that, speaking in behalf of a number on our side of the aisle, I am intensely interested in the same proposition of the gentleman from Iowa, and I hope the gentleman will bring it back to the House for consideration.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas what his attitude will be in regard to the amendment put on in the Senate to abolish the stop-watch proposition? I presume the gentleman is fairly well informed of the history of this. There are a great number of gentlemen in the House who would like to have an opportunity to express themselves. Can the gentleman give some assurance that we will be given an opportunity to secure that—

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not give the gentleman any assurance as to what the action of the conferees will be, but I think undoubtedly that the gentleman will have an opportunity to discuss the matter in the House.

Mr. HULL. And have a vote on it in the House?

Mr. ANTHONY. I can assure him—

Mr. BLANTON. It has to come back; it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. HULL. There is a question about the point of order which must be raised at the proper time.

Mr. ANTHONY. I told the gentleman from Iowa yesterday what my judgment was on the matter.

Mr. BLANTON. I intend to make a point of order against it so quick as to make the gentleman's head swim.

Mr. HULL. That is all right; the gentleman made a point of order before and he has been overruled by the best parliamentarians of the House. We are willing to argue the point of order. All we ask of the conferees is that they shall bring it back to the House the same as is promised as to the others.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman from Kansas express any opinion as to the amendment put on in the Senate raising the rank of the President's aid, Colonel Sherrill, to that of brigadier general?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that is an entirely new proposition put on by the Senate, and one that, as far as I know, none of the House conferees have ever discussed. I know it has not been discussed by the House conferees, and on all matters of military legislation, I want to say to the gentleman that it is the disposition of the conferees to consult freely the members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, especially on their ideas of these things.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I want to remind the gentleman that two years ago we sat together, he and I, with our colleagues of the Committee on Military Affairs, while we framed

the Army reorganization act, and one of the particular features of that act was designed to remove the evil consequences of what might be called perhaps preferential appointment of Army officers theretofore by assigning them to details whereby a man of a lesser grade might be advanced to some higher grade that carried with it pay. We thought that by the passage of that Army reorganization act we had put an end for all time to such mischief by making it absolutely impossible to change the grade of a man by detail; that if a man was to be assigned to a place where a major was wanted, a major would be sent rather than promote a captain to be a major, and then send him. Now, we do not want to violate that principle, which is one of the fundamental principles in the whole act. I hope the gentleman, and the conferees on the part of the House, will keep that in mind, or else we will lose a most important victory which we achieved over old-time favoritism.

Mr. HICKS. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall object if we can not ask the gentleman some questions. If we can not do that I will object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. HICKS. I will insist upon it, Mr. Speaker. Then, perhaps, we can get through with it.

Mr. CRAMTON. We can have an agreement on that question.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] several questions.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Kansas has acted as a conferee on many occasions, and I do not think he has ever violated the confidence of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask some questions. I will remind the gentleman from Kansas, who has the matter in charge, that what is known as the Dickinson amendment, I believe, that he stated he would be disposed to bring that back.

Mr. ANTHONY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BLANTON. But what is known as the Sherrill amendment—that is, to make a brigadier general out of Colonel Sherrill—and what is known as the Hull amendment, which was placed on in the Senate, concerning the exercise of watchfulness by the Government over some of its employees—those are two matters that had to be brought back here?

Mr. ANTHONY. Of course, if they are agreed to in conference they must be brought back to the House first.

Mr. BLANTON. But if the Senate, which put them on the bill, is disposed to yield on that proposition, the gentleman would not have to bring them back. He would not have to bring them back if the Senate receded from them. As to the matter referred to by my colleague [Mr. CONNALLY], every father and mother in the Nation having boys under 18 or 20 years of age is interested in it; and upon that and the Dickinson matter I hope the gentleman will give the House an opportunity to pass.

Mr. ANTHONY. On any question where there is a considerable number of Members of the House vitally interested we shall be disposed to bring it back.

Mr. BLANTON. Very well. One more suggestion and then I am done. The same agreement was made by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], who indicated that he would give the House an opportunity to act upon certain matters. He asked to disagree to all the Senate amendments, and yet he went into conference and had the House recede in 40 different amendments, involving \$800,000.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman just one question.

Mr. MONDELL. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will withdraw my reservation of an objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will we have an opportunity to vote on the increase to officers in training camps?

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not say that a vote will be given on that question, but a full and free conference will be had on that question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? If not, the Chair will appoint the conferees.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before the conferees are appointed I ask leave to make a motion of instruction.

The SPEAKER. It is supposed that there will be a full and free conference.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will make a motion to instruct on this particular amendment, but if the gentleman will assure me that we will have a vote, I will not make the motion.

The SPEAKER. Even under instructions of the House the Chair believes that the conferees under the rules are not allowed to agree to that. They may not bring it back.

Mr. BLANTON. They struck it out.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was not aware of that.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The Senate struck it out. If the gentleman will give me that assurance I will withdraw my suggestion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. STAFFORD, and Mr. SISSON.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the pending District of Columbia appropriation conference report comes before the House recommending the smallest increase over the original bill as reported to the House of any District appropriation bill, probably, in 20 years. I shall want to insert some figures; but, desiring to protect the time of the House, I will ask unanimous consent that I may have the right to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Briefly, the action of the conferees, so far as an agreement is reported, adds to the bill that went to the Senate from the House only \$309,380. But there are reductions proposed by the Senate, which were accepted by the House conferees, amounting to \$240,000. So the net increase at the present stage of affairs, if the pending report is accepted—the net increase on the bill as it passed the House would be only \$69,380.

There are items receded from by the Senate to the amount of \$515,998 carried in the pending report. There were in addition items stricken out on the floor of the House that were originally recommended by the committee to the House which will come up under the rules of the House requiring a separate vote on items that would have been subject to a point of order in the House. That includes \$550,000 for library site, playground sites, and school buildings and grounds, and we will move later to restore those items. If the action that has already been taken by the conferees is indorsed by the House and if the further action that we will recommend upon these items that would have been subject to a point of order is indorsed by the House, then the total of the bill, the appropriation act for 1924, will be \$22,778,915. That amount will be \$72,694.80 below the 1923 appropriation. It will be \$772,215 below the Budget recommendation for 1924. It will be \$1,691,070 below the bill as it passed the Senate, and it will be only \$154,020 above the bill as the committee originally reported it to this House. So I say it will be the smallest increase, I believe, comparing the bill that came from the Committee on Appropriations to the House and the final action, of any District bill in many years.

In connection with that I will insert in the RECORD a detailed statement of the increases on particular items. On most of them, small items, I will not take the time of the House. I would, however, call attention to the item of paving, on which the Senate made material reductions and some increases. We have accepted reductions of \$225,000, and then additions have been made of \$23,600, so that the net reduction below the House bill is \$202,400.

In the main, the Senate went a little further on the same policy which the House had adopted in giving emphasis to the paving of unpaved streets where they are 100 per cent built up on both sides.

There is in reference to schools this situation: We give another \$1,000 for transportation of tubercular pupils, \$1,500 for laboratory supplies, \$50,000 for repairs of buildings, and \$100,000 for land adjacent to the Dunbar High School. That is to say, the bill as reported to the House carried every item in the budget that meant a new seat for a pupil in the schools. Some of these which were struck out in the House on a point of order we will ask that they be restored by a separate vote. The only new item we recommended in this report or that we will recommend by a separate vote is the item of \$100,000 for land adjacent to the Dunbar School. That has not been before the House before. In regard to that, this is the situation: There is a splendid stadium adjoining the Central High School for the white children. There is a proposal for an athletic field adjoining the Western High. There is no athletic field for the colored schools. They have quite a colored educational center out here on First Street. There is the Armstrong Manual Training School on O Street, and on the opposite side in the next block is the Dunbar High; then they have the Shaw Junior High for colored two or three blocks away, and

in that vicinity there are several colored grade schools. There is land adjacent to the Dunbar High School which is in a large part undeveloped. There are some shacks and poor buildings on a portion of it and some better buildings on another part. If they can have the land which is recommended in this report they can develop an athletic field where sports can be conducted by the colored students in the schools.

They have athletic teams in the Dunbar High, in the Armstrong Manual Training, and in the Shaw Junior High Schools. They have teams which meet other teams from Baltimore, Alexandria, and other places for contests. The only place that they can go now is to the American League Baseball Park or down on the Monument Lot. In the latter case they can not charge for attendance. The proposed field would be located near all these schools and in the midst of a large colored population.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman has referred to the fact that provision had been made for an athletic field adjoining the Western High School.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not so familiar with that; it is not carried in the bill.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. They very much need one out there at the Western High, but I did not know that there was a proposition for one.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think it is in contemplation.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. It certainly ought to be done, because they have no facilities of that kind there now.

Mr. CRAMTON. I knew it was contemplated, and I thought it was under way. They have adjoining the Central High, as the gentleman well knows, a fine stadium. But there is nothing available for the colored students.

There is another important provision in the bill. Last year was the first year that the item of new buildings for schools was made immediately available. We expedite the new work of construction proposed by making it available when the bill passes as early as this. This will be a law before February is closed. We have gone further and made the appropriations for land also immediately available. There is one item of the bill to buy more land and another item for building upon it. By making the land immediately available, as well as for the building, we are assured of expediting it to the utmost.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. YOUNG. In a case of this kind, where the officials ask money to purchase land, I would like to know whether they get options on the land before that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think they do not.

Mr. YOUNG. If they did not, it seems to me they might be held up when the owners understood that there was a fat appropriation for it.

Mr. CRAMTON. That might be true in some cases. In some cases the selection of the land is limited, but they have the remedy of condemnation proceedings. In other cases we have given them the option of selection between certain limits—as, for instance, between Georgia Avenue and Sixteenth Street and north of Park Road.

There are various features in the bill that would interest the House, but I am going to call attention only to the matter of allowance for officials for the use of their own automobiles or motor cycles in public business. In the current year it was \$13 for a motor cycle and \$26 for an automobile. Our bill carried \$10 for a motor cycle and \$20 for an automobile, and those figures have been accepted by the Senate. Also there is a limitation on the appropriation for Public Utilities Commission to guard against further expenditure for special legal services. That limitation proposed by the House has been accepted by the Senate conferees.

The name of the new bridge in Georgetown will interest the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL]. The name he suggested—Francis Scott Key—will be the official name. The result of this conference report and the further motions that we will offer, if accepted by the House, will, as I stated before, make \$22,778,915.

Following is the detailed financial statement:

Appropriated, 1923 act.....	\$22,851,609.80
Proposed in Budget for 1924.....	23,551,130.00
Bill as reported to House carried.....	22,624,895.00
Bill as passed by House carried.....	22,078,607.00
Reduction by House.....	546,288.00
Bill as passed by Senate carried.....	24,469,985.00
Less amount carried as passed by House.....	22,078,607.00
Senate increase.....	2,391,378.00

Money effect of action agreed upon:	
Of amount added by Senate; conferees agreed to.	\$309,380.00
Of reductions proposed by Senate (\$248,000); conferees acceded to	240,000.00
Total increase over House bill agreed to in conference (excludes reduction of \$72 as result of action upon amendment No. 100)	69,380.00
Net amount of Senate increases receded from by Senate conferees	515,998.00
Amount involved in amendments not agreed to but which House conferees will propose favorable action upon	631,000.00
Amount involved in amendments not agreed to and on which the House conferees will not recommend favorable action	1,175,000.00
Total	2,391,378.00

So at this stage the bill, so far as affected by the conference report, adds to the amount carried when passed by the House \$69,308 (\$72 being taken off on account of action on amendment No. 100, which reduced a total not in conference), which will be made with respect to amendments not agreed to there will be added the further sum of \$631,000, or a total over the bill as passed by the House of \$700,308, or but \$154,020 more than the bill carried as originally reported to the House and \$1,691,070 less than proposed by the Senate.

Of the sum of \$631,000 which it is proposed to recommend for acceptance, \$550,000 represents items reported by the Appropriations Committee of the House and stricken from the bill on points of order, namely:

Mount Pleasant branch library	\$25,000
Playground sites	25,000
School buildings and grounds	500,000
The amendments agreed to in conference making up the larger portion of the \$309,380 are—	
Garbage removal	\$35,000
Lighting	22,000
Land adjoining Dunbar High School	100,000
Repairs to school buildings	50,000

If the action heretofore taken by the House conferees and that about to be recommended is approved by the House the amount appropriated—

Will be	\$22,778,915.00
Which is below the 1923 appropriations	72,694.80
Which is below the 1924 Budget	772,215.00
Which is below the Senate figure on this bill	1,691,070.00
Which is above the original House committee report	154,020.00

Changes recommended in House bill:

	Increase.	Decrease.
Veterinary supplies	\$100	
Collector, one more baiff	1,200	
Municipal architect (two Ford runabouts)	1,100	
Temporary services, surveyor's office	3,000	
Rent Commission, salary of commissioners	9,250	
Library, Southeast branch, one assistant	1,000	
Contingent	2,500	
Postage	1,500	
Paving:		
Reduce	\$225,000	
Add	23,600	
		\$201,400
Trees and parkings	5,000	
Garbage collection	35,000	
Current	\$750,000	
House	825,000	
Senate	900,000	
Lighting:		
General supplies	2,500	
Maintenance	22,000	
House	\$450,000	
Schools:		
Transportation tubercular pupils	1,000	
Laboratory supplies	1,500	
Dunbar land	100,000	
Repairs to buildings, etc.	50,000	
Police:		
Fuel	1,500	
Maintenance and replacement motor equipment	10,000	
Harbor patrol, fuel, etc.	500	
Health:		
Bacteriological laboratory	100	
Chemical laboratory	250	
New dog pens	250	
Child hygiene	3,000	
Charities and corrections:		
Maintenance of ambulances	100	
Screening jail	3,250	
Reformatory, maintenance	4,000	
Eastern Dispensary and Casualty Hospital	10,000	
Gallinger Hospital, repairs	2,000	
Home for Aged and Infirm, employee	180	
Parks:		
Maintenance of various reservations	5,000	
Treating macadam roads	2,000	
Outdoor sports		5,000
Plans for Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway	4,000	
Lighting public grounds	13,000	

As I have said, the amount as proposed by the House conferees for the entire building is \$22,778,915. The cost to the Federal Treasury out of that will be something less than \$8,300,000. The immediate proportion will be larger than that, but some of the fees, and so forth, payments for paving, and such things, go back into the Treasury in the same proportion that the District or the Federal Government contributes for

them; and basing it upon the best opinion available, that will be sufficient to bring the Federal contribution in this bill to something less than \$8,300,000. In connection with that I am going to take the liberty of inserting, under the leave given me, some reference to a proposed change in this system of contribution, and in connection with that will also include a very interesting statement as to the Federal contribution that has been prepared at my request by the auditor of the District of Columbia, showing what the actual contribution of the Federal Government has been year by year for the past 10 years.

I have introduced H. R. 14253, as follows:

A bill to fix the amount to be contributed by the United States toward defraying expenses of the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after July 1, 1924, the Government of the United States shall not bear any fixed proportion of the expenses of the District of Columbia but shall pay the sum of \$8,000,000 annually toward defraying such expenses of the District as may be appropriated for by law.

SEC. 2. That on and after such date there shall be credited wholly to the District of Columbia any revenue now required by law to be credited to the District of Columbia and the United States in the same proportion that each contributed to the activity or source from whence such revenue was derived.

SEC. 3. That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to prevent, until July 1, 1927, the advancements permitted to be made for expenses of the District by the Treasury Department in accordance with the first paragraph of section 1 of the District of Columbia appropriation act approved June 29, 1922.

I believe it highly desirable, both for the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, that the change I propose in the Federal contribution to District expenses be made. The property interests of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, so far as land area, and so forth, is concerned, have reached an approximate maximum, while the development of other property interests in the District is going on at a constantly increasing ratio. The rapid growth of population in the District, accompanied by an even greater real-estate development and increase in other taxable property, make it imperative, in fairness to the Federal Treasury, that the old proportional policy of contribution be thrown into the discard.

I propose in lieu of this that a fixed amount each year be contributed by the Federal Government toward the expenses of the District and suggest as that amount \$8,000,000. That is approximately the amount the Federal Treasury contributes at the present time under the present plan, and while there are many in Congress who criticize the present Federal contribution as too liberal, in view of the extremely low tax rate in the District of Columbia I think consent of Congress to that amount as a fixed annual contribution could be secured.

I am aware that the first impulse of District residents may be one of opposition to my suggestion. I believe, however, that on consideration it will be realized that the best interests of the District in the years to come, its most rapid development can be secured under the plan which I suggest. At the present time Congress feels that the total appropriations for the government and development of the District of Columbia must be restricted to such an amount that the Federal share thereof, at present 40 per cent, shall not constitute an undue burden upon the Federal Treasury. At the same time the city is developing, as I have said, and its needs in many directions are acute, as is the case in any growing city. The tax rate is low, and some increase in it could be borne by the District without undue hardship and I think would be borne cheerfully in the interest of a more rapid development of the District needs in the way of paving, schools, sewers, lighting, police, fire protection, and so forth. If the plan I propose were adopted, and the contribution of the Federal Treasury were a fixed, stipulated sum, I am sure the disposition of Congress would be to expedite development of such District matters as rapidly as the sentiment of the people of the District might demand within a reasonable tax rate. At the present time Congress is inclined to feel that District support for increased expenditures is the more enthusiastic because so large a part of the proposed expenditure must be made from the Federal Treasury. The realization that the entire expenditure beyond the \$8,000,000 must come from District revenues would, no doubt, have a sobering influence upon some propagandists for reckless expenditures; but where real need existed and a pronounced public sentiment was manifested for the expenditure of money to be contributed solely by the people of the District I am sure that appropriations would be made by Congress in response to such a demand. I think the people of the District are sincere in their demand for needed improvements in the District, and that a slight increase in the tax rate to meet more rapid filling of those demands would be cheerfully met. I am satisfied that my bill provides very just treatment of the Federal Treasury and a more liberal policy of development for the District.

The following is the letter and statement by Colonel Donovan, auditor of the District:

FEBRUARY 10, 1923.

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Mr. Pugh, one of the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations, telephoned me last evening that you desired I should prepare for your use a statement covering the fiscal years beginning with 1913 and ending with 1922, showing the total expenditures made by the District of Columbia from appropriations for each of said years, with the proportions charged, respectively, to the District of Columbia and the United States, and showing further the receipts collected by the District and covered into the Treasury to the credit of the United States for each of said years, with the resulting net expenditure charge to the United States.

It was not practicable to prepare a statement literally as requested within the short time allowed, as it is not customary to analyze expenditures on the basis of division between the United States and the District. But the information contained in the statement is substantially about what I understand you wish. The statement shows the total appropriations for each of the fiscal years named, with the proportion charged to each the United States and the District, the receipts credited to the United States, with the resulting net charge to the United States.

In determining the total appropriations for each fiscal year deductions have been made for unexpended balances of appropriations which lapsed under limitations of law, and were covered into the surplus fund by warrants issued by the Secretary of the Treasury. The appropriations are therefore purely on a net basis and as set up approximate very closely the expenditures in each year. The statement assumes the expenditure of the unexpended balances of appropriations on June 30, 1922, amounting to \$3,307,414.94, of which amount the sum of \$2,076,725.99 is chargeable to the revenues of the District and \$1,230,688.95 to the revenues of the United States. Practically this entire amount was obligated prior to June 30, 1922, but would not mature for payment until after July 1.

The net approximate average expenditure from the revenues of the United States, on the basis adopted in the preparation of the statement, for each of the years beginning with 1913 and ending with 1922 is \$7,089,405.27. Using such an average does not present a fair answer considered in the light of conditions of to-day. In 1913 the total appropriations amounted to \$11,317,440, while in 1922 they were \$22,254,670, an increase of nearly 100 per cent. The charge to the United States in 1913 was only \$5,344,857, under the half-and-half system, while in 1922 the charge was \$8,456,313, with the United States paying but 40 per cent.

Very truly yours,

D. J. DONOVAN,
Auditor of the District of Columbia.

Statement showing appropriations of the District of Columbia for each fiscal year beginning with July 1, 1912, and ending with June 30, 1922; the proportion of such appropriations chargeable to the District and the United States; the amount of District receipts credited to the United States during each of said years, and the resulting net appropriation charge to the United States for each year.

Fiscal year.	Total appropriation.	Charged to District.	Charged to United States.	Receipts credited to United States.	Net charge to United States.
1913.....	\$11,317,440.87	\$5,710,618.15	\$5,606,822.72	\$261,965.23	\$5,344,857.49
1914.....	11,801,768.01	5,960,541.28	5,841,226.73	232,888.95	5,608,339.78
1915.....	13,592,688.48	7,002,266.92	6,590,431.56	215,909.82	6,374,521.74
1916.....	12,358,687.50	6,265,071.94	6,103,615.57	275,440.02	5,828,175.55
1917.....	14,358,755.81	7,299,152.02	7,059,603.79	255,865.13	6,803,738.66
1918.....	15,879,083.48	8,007,946.48	7,871,136.99	211,771.33	7,659,365.65
1919.....	17,157,762.52	8,841,540.78	8,316,221.74	368,025.63	7,918,196.11
1920.....	19,185,394.34	9,728,437.50	9,456,956.84	394,332.93	9,062,623.91
1921.....	21,097,753.13	12,774,822.06	8,322,931.07	515,010.55	7,807,920.52
1922.....	22,254,670.79	13,385,892.58	8,898,778.21	412,464.89	8,456,313.32
	159,004,004.93	84,956,279.71	74,037,725.22	3,143,672.48	70,894,052.74
1923.....		13,162,841.88	8,650,747.92	314,367.00	8,346,380.92
1924.....		13,106,149.80	8,631,745.20	314,367.00	8,317,378.20

NOTE.—The foregoing statement assumes the expenditure of the unexpended balances of appropriations on June 30, 1922, amounting to \$3,307,414.94. Of this amount the sum chargeable to the revenues of the District of Columbia is \$2,076,725.99, and to the revenues of the United States \$1,230,688.95.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In that connection, since it is a matter that is going to be a very material question before long, could the gentleman not have gone back to 1878, at the time when the Government was paying 50 per cent of the \$15,000,000 bond issue, and 50 per cent of the million-dollar bond issue which was subsequently issued, and guaranteeing all of the \$15,000,000 bond issue, so that we would understand exactly what the Government has contributed?

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman will understand that in the last appropriation bill for the District of Columbia there was carried a provision for a joint commission to go into that very matter. A report has been filed. I feel that it is only a very partial performance of what the law demanded, and perhaps sometime I shall expand my ideas more upon that; but this was simply a request, which the auditor very kindly complied with on short notice, and only covers the 10 years which I speak of.

Mr. BLANTON. This is just what the commission did.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is not as comprehensive even as their work. It only relates to the net expenditure from the Federal Treasury for this purpose.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Is it not also true that in fixing that amount, as fixed by the chairman, which is appropriated from the exclusive Federal revenues, you have not made probable deductions which will certainly come from returns from activities in the District to which both the District and the Federal Government have contributed or shall contribute?

Mr. CRAMTON. An estimate has been made.

Mr. EVANS. Is that included in the deduction?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Covering both rentals and fines?

Mr. CRAMTON. The estimate is supposed to. Of course, it can not be accurate. It may vary one or two hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think it would have been very valuable information for the House if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] had had our auditor go back to the time when the District was under its own management and was issuing bonds in \$15,000,000 blocks, behind which the Government was placing the credit of the people of the United States, 50 per cent of which, together with the interest thereon, the people of the whole country paid. We are going to have to look into this question of the fiscal relations between the District and the Government a little more closely. There is a move already on foot now to try and establish a credit here of four and a half million dollars in the Treasury to the benefit of the District, and I am sorry that the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. EVANS], who now sits on this floor, is not going to be with us in the next term when that fight comes up. We need him here, because he, in my judgment, more than any other Member, except the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], has given this matter close study and investigation.

Years ago this Government built the entire water system conduit and paid for it out of the people's money and permitted the people here in the District to rent the water out and get the returns for that, and they have made no recompense whatever to the Government for it. While the Government has paid the expense of its courts, the District has collected its own fines and its own penalties and taken in other revenue in many respects without accounting to the Government for any portion of same, where the cost of the proceeding was paid up to a short time ago 50 per cent by the people of the United States and is now paid 40 per cent by the people generally. And yet because Congress has permitted the people in this District to pay taxes, now \$1.30 on the hundred, and never since 1878 having been more than 2 per cent lower than the taxes paid in any other city, as their part of the expense of running this big city of 437,000 people, that being all of the expense that the people here have to pay, because of these facts and because Congress was liberal and has paid out money for many of the District's own expenses directly from the Treasury, some of that \$1.30 taxes did not go into the expenses and left a little surplus over every year, they now claim that they should be given back that part of their little \$1.30 tax which was unused, aggregating about \$4,500,000 as a cash surplus to their credit. It is the most absurd and ridiculous proposition I ever heard of.

I can not stop the passage of any of these provisions that the Senate has placed on this bill. If I could do so I would, if I had to fight here until sundown; but I can not stop it. There is no better man in this House than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], there is no man who has the interest of the people more at heart than he, and yet he as one of the conferees has been forced to recede from the disagreement of the House to 43 different amendments placed on in the Senate and accept the same; and there are others here which he has had to bring back because they are legislative items, which he has promised to accept, which items involve \$800,000 of the people's money, or approximately that amount, more than the bill carried when the House got through with it and sent it to the Senate.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman desires to be accurate. It was \$631,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Six hundred and thirty-one thousand dollars that the gentleman has already receded from.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And in addition to that there is about \$140,000 more that he is going to try to get the House to accept, besides several hundred thousand dollars more which he is going to fight here. The amount he has already receded from plus the amount that he is going to try to let stay in amounts to approximately \$800,000, the sum that I stated. I

was not speaking inadvisedly when I made that statement. It was a matter of investigation and computation.

Mr. CRAMTON. The amount that would have been subject to the point of order which we recommend is \$631,000.

Mr. BLANTON. How much more is it that you are not going to recommend?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is one item included in the report of \$500,000 on which the Senate has already receded.

Mr. BLANTON. We are going to fight that.

Mr. CRAMTON. But that is already defeated in conference, and that is for the recorder of deeds building. There is another item of \$675,000 on which I hope—

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about amendments the gentleman is not going to agree to—

Mr. CRAMTON. But I am trying to tell him. There is an item of \$675,000 for parks which I shall hope we shall disagree upon.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, as a matter of fact there is an amount of \$800,000 here that could go into the bill without very much trouble, more than the bill contained when the bill left the House and went to the Senate; not as the bill was brought into the House, but as it left the House and went to the Senate. How much longer are the people of your State, Michigan, California, and Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, and New York, how long are your taxpayers going to continue to pay the expenses of the schools of the District of Columbia, buying the land, building these million and a half dollar plants like the Central High and the Eastern High, and all these other splendid high schools here, paying 50 per cent of all of same until just a short time ago, for the expenses of 2,500 teachers to teach 66,000 school children? Now the people of the United States pay 40 per cent of this expense, but how much longer will your people at home feel like doing that? When you go home in the summer and speak on the hustings, do you tell the people that you tax them 40 per cent for these playgrounds, these \$100,000 playgrounds that the gentleman from Michigan is going to add to this Dunbar Colored School, that they are paying 40 per cent on all these numerous school buildings, do you tell them that?

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. COLTON. Does the gentleman have any figures of the number of these children who come from the States and are not permanent residents of the District?

Mr. BLANTON. Does that matter? Why should our constituents pay for their children? My children are here, why should not I pay for them, and I ought to pay for them. Why should I tax my people at home and your people to pay for my children here in the District? I have no right to do it. They have their school taxes down in Texas, they have their State taxes and their county taxes and their city taxes, their municipal taxes, and all kinds, and why should I tax them to pay for the teaching of my children here? That is the question you have got to settle sooner or later, because if you do not settle it the people at home are going to change the personnel of this House, and that quickly. They are getting tired of it. There are civic improvements here that pertain only to the conveniences of the rich residents of this city, wholly unconnected with the Government, and your people are getting tired of paying for them. We ought to stop it. The bill which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] introduced day before yesterday which will let the whole people pay \$8,000,000 only is just a drop in the bucket. That is a step in the right direction. I am for his bill as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I believe I have given more study to this question than the gentleman has, but I will yield.

Mr. COLTON. The only question, I take it the gentleman pays his school taxes in Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. And that will be a double tax for your children while here?

Mr. BLANTON. As a matter of fact there are 66,000 school children in the District and 2,500 live in Virginia and Maryland and they get their schooling free, they get their books furnished free, and the taxpayers in the gentleman's State and mine now pay 40 per cent of all that expense. It ought not to be.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for one minute to answer the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the question of the gentleman?

Mr. TINCHER. I ask for information. The gentleman says he has given much thought to it. What per cent does the gentleman think the National Capital of the Nation should contribute?

Mr. BLANTON. I tell you what I think, and the gentleman from Kansas is a man usually of good judgment when he has not got politics on his brain. If you make the local tax rate here in the District at least 3 per cent—that is what the Kansas people pay; that is what the New York people pay; that is what the California people pay; that is what the gentleman's people and mine pay—3 per cent instead of 1.30 and let the Government pay the balance, I am willing. But until you fix a proper, reasonable tax rate here it is an infamous injustice to the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, amendment No. 24, after line 21, insert:

"MOUNT PLEASANT BRANCH LIBRARY.

"For the purchase of a site for a branch of the free public library in the Mount Pleasant-Columbia Heights section of the District of Columbia, \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, and authority is hereby conferred upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to accept from the Carnegie Corporation of New York not less than \$100,000 for the purpose of erecting a suitable branch library building on such a site, subject to the approval of said commissioners and the board of library trustees."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the restoration of the item recommended to the House which went out in the House on a point of order. I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33, page 23, beginning line 1, insert: "For the erection of a fireproof addition to the courthouse of the District of Columbia, for the use of the office of the recorder of deeds and such other activities of the District government as the commissioners may designate, including fireproof vaults and heating and ventilating apparatus, to be constructed under the supervision of and on plans to be furnished by the Architect of the Capitol and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$500,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment proposed by the Senate an appropriation of \$500,000 for an addition to the courthouse to house the recorder of deeds and other activities. I shall offer an amendment that does not carry any appropriation and is for preparation of plans and estimates upon such a building. I move that the House recede and concur with the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"The Architect of the Capitol, in collaboration with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall prepare plans for the erection of a fireproof addition to the courthouse of the District of Columbia for the use of the office of the recorder of deeds and such other activities of the government of the District of Columbia as the commissioners may designate, including fireproof vaults and heating and ventilating apparatus, and such plans, together with an estimate of the cost of construction in accordance therewith, shall be transmitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 55, on page 37, beginning with line 1, insert: "For the purchase of a site now occupied by Hoover Playground, located in square 546, containing 65,000 square feet, at 25 cents per square foot, \$17,000;

"For the purchase of a site at Twenty-seventh and O Streets NW, in square 1238 (803), containing 10,000 square feet, at an estimated cost of \$5,000; and for the purchase of lot 804, square 1238, containing 3,840 square feet, at \$3,000; in all \$8,000.

"So much of any balance remaining after the purchase of sites for playgrounds authorized by this act as is necessary to clean up, grade, drain, fence in, and place such sites in safe and suitable condition for the purposes intended, may be used for such purposes."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the gentleman's motion.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur. Upon that I shall only say that this is a restora-

tion of an appropriation and language as originally reported to the House from the committee. It went out in the House on a point of order.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that at the end of the gentleman's amendment he add the following proviso: "Provided, That the cost of the above shall be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which is not in order now, but it may come later. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 37, line 19, strike out "\$111,032, to be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia," and insert "\$136,032."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, on that item I propose to recede and concur with an amendment. Under the amendment the amount for maintenance of playgrounds will be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, \$111,032; \$25,000 for purchase of sites will continue under the 60-40 plan. I offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON moves to recede and concur with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$136,032, of which \$111,032 shall be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be expended for the purchase of sites for playgrounds and for the improvement of such playgrounds, shall be paid 40 per cent out of the Treasury of the United States and 60 per cent out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 43, in line 18, after the word "including," insert "administrative principals."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that the House recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 45, line 24, after the word "work," insert "administrative principals of elementary schools."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 75: In line 3, page 54, after the word "land," strike out "adjacent to" and insert "in the vicinity of."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, that is a proposal restoring the language originally reported by the House, which went out on a point of order in the House. The paragraph had to be modified, but for the reason suggested by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young], the original House language being preferable, I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 76: Page 54, line 10, insert:
"For the purchase of a site on which to locate a 16-room building between Georgia Avenue and Sixteenth Street NW., north of Park Road, \$60,000;

"For the erection of an 8-room extensible building on the site to be purchased in the vicinity of Georgia Avenue and Sixteenth Street NW., north of Park Road, \$130,000;

"For the erection of an 8-room extensible building, including a combination assembly hall and gymnasium, on the site to be purchased in the vicinity of and to relieve the Tenley School, \$160,000;

"For beginning the erection of a 16-room building, including a combination assembly hall and gymnasium, to replace the old John F. Cook School, \$100,000, and the commissioners are hereby authorized to enter into contract or contracts for such building at a cost not to exceed \$250,000;

"For the purchase of a new site on which to locate a junior high school between Twentieth Street and Rock Creek and K and O Streets NW., or vicinity, \$50,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment. I will state that the language

which is covered by the Senate amendment No. 76 is simply a restoration of the language originally reported by the House, which went out on a point of order in the House, and the action I propose now is to accept that language with two small changes to clarify it. I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House recede and concur with an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the words "in the vicinity of," and in lieu thereof insert "between"; and, in line 15 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "contracts," insert "as in this act provided."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to offer an amendment?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas to offer an amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, these are all for school buildings here in Washington?

Mr. CRAMTON. Buildings or land.

Mr. BLANTON. Buildings or land connected with the school system?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. It relates to buildings and land for schools in the District of Columbia? It is not for Government buildings for departments?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; it is not for Government buildings for departments.

Mr. BLANTON. I offer the following amendment, that at the end of the matter inserted by the Senate add the following: "Provided, That the cost of the above shall be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order. I do not want to interfere at all with the gentleman getting his proposition before the House, but to keep the record straight the motion should be a motion to recede and concur with an amendment, and to accomplish that, it not being preferential, we would need to divide the question first and let the House recede. If the gentleman desires, I will ask that the question be divided.

Mr. BLANTON. My amendment is an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, did not the gentleman from Michigan make a motion to recede and concur with an amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the motion that the gentleman made.

Mr. HICKS. Then the motion of the gentleman from Texas must be an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I offered it as, to add the following proviso.

Mr. CRAMTON. I was thinking my motion was to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman made a motion to recede and concur with an amendment, and to that the gentleman from Texas offers an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a motion to amend a motion to recede and concur with an amendment is not in order.

Mr. BLANTON. I contend that it is in order when the chairman yields, and again, the point of order of the gentleman from Maryland comes too late.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I do not insist on it.

Mr. HICKS. It seems to me that the point made by the gentleman from Texas is good; while it might have been subject to a point of order, it comes too late.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think it is subject to a point of order, but my point of order is good against the gentleman's point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Texas to the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON to the amendment of Mr. CRAMTON: Add, at the end of the amendment: "Provided, That the cost of the above shall be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 2, noes 29.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, line 17, strike out the figures "\$700,000" and insert "\$1,460,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the item carrying the total amount for new schools and new land and buildings for the schools, and I move to recede and concur with an amendment carrying the correct total.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the sum proposed insert \$1,300,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, line 23, insert the following:

"That the board of trustees of the National Training School for Girls of the District of Columbia, a body corporate, is hereby authorized and directed to purchase, subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, a tract of land of not more than 160 acres, to be situated in the District of Columbia or in the State of Maryland or in the State of Virginia, for the use of said school; and the said board of trustees are hereby authorized to construct on said tract two buildings, of sufficient capacity to accommodate not more than 150 persons, the plans and specifications for which shall be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia before acceptance by said board of trustees: *Provided*, That the purchase price for the said tract of land, the erection of the said buildings, and all expenses incidental thereto shall not exceed the sum of \$62,000, which amount is hereby appropriated. The title to the said tract of land shall be taken directly to and in the name of the United States; and in case a satisfactory price can not be agreed upon for the purchase of said tract, or in case the title to said tract can not be made satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States, then the latter is directed to procure said tract of land by condemnation, and the expense of procuring evidence of title, or of condemnation, or both, shall be paid out of the appropriation herein made for the purchase of said tract. The said board of trustees may, within their discretion, transport to the aforesaid tract for such periods as they may see fit any of the girls which may have been committed to said school in the District of Columbia, and the said board of trustees shall have the same power and authority over such girls during the period of their commitment to said tract, or while they are being conducted to or from said tract, as they now possess over such girls within the limits of the District of Columbia."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON moves to recede and concur with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The president of the board of trustees of the National Training School for Girls of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized and directed to purchase a tract of land of not more than 160 acres, situated in the District of Columbia or in the State of Maryland or in the State of Virginia, as a site for the use of said school, and the said board of trustees is hereby authorized to construct on said tract buildings of sufficient capacity to accommodate not more than 150 persons, the plans and specifications for which shall be prepared by the municipal architect of the District of Columbia. The purchase price for the said tract of land, the erection of the said buildings, and all expenses incidental thereto shall not exceed the sum of \$62,000, which amount is hereby appropriated for that purpose. The title to the said property shall be taken directly to and in the name of the United States; and in case a satisfactory price can not be agreed upon for the purchase of said land or in case the title can not be made satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States, then the latter is directed to acquire said tract of land by condemnation, and the expense of procuring evidence of title or of condemnation, or both, shall be paid out of the appropriation herein made for the purchase of said tract. The board of trustees of said school may, in their discretion, remove and transport to the aforesaid tract for such legal periods as they may see fit any of the girls who may have been committed to the National Training School for Girls in the District of Columbia, and the board of trustees of said school shall have the same power and authority over such girls during the period of their commitment to said tract or while they are being conducted to or from said tract as they now possess over such girls within the limits of the District of Columbia. When the buildings herein authorized to be constructed shall be in readiness to receive girls committed to the National Training School for Girls, it shall not be lawful to keep white and colored girls on the same reservations under the control of the board of trustees of said school."

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the proposal for the erection of a new school been considered by the House?

Mr. CRAMTON. It was considered by the committee in charge of the bill, and hearings were held. It was not reported favorably to the House, however, but further hearings were held by the Senate, and the Senate recommends the item.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are the present quarters unsuitable for the use of this school?

Mr. CRAMTON. The difficulty is in having the girls of the two races in adjacent buildings in the same institution. That is urged as undesirable, and the purpose of this amendment is to authorize a second reservation under the same board where the white girls will be quartered and have the colored girls remain in the present institution, or they could reverse that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Have the estimates been submitted to the committee whereby a tract of 160 acres can be purchased and two buildings erected for the outside figure of \$62,000?

Mr. CRAMTON. The item in the bill carries language that came to Congress from the Budget, but the language does have a possibility of seeking the impossible if it were carried out strictly.

The language that we propose now is entirely within the limits of possibility. In fact, some definite propositions have been given some consideration which would come well within the requirements of the proposed amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. What was the reason that the conferees made the change in respect to the person who is to make the purchase?

Mr. CRAMTON. That language was arrived at in conference in order to meet the views of all of the conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 112: Page 87 of the bill, at the top of the page, insert: "The paragraph in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1923, approved June 29, 1922, which reads as follows:

"The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to use a site for a home and school for feeble-minded persons, said site to be located in the District of Columbia on lands owned by the District of Columbia and now allotted to the Home for the Aged and Infirm, and to erect thereon suitable buildings at a total cost not exceeding \$250,000, and toward said purpose there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$100,000, to be immediately available. The persons to be admissible thereto and the proceedings with reference to securing such admission to be in accordance with law—is hereby repealed; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to acquire a site for a home and school for feeble-minded persons, said site to be located in the District of Columbia or in the State of Maryland or in the State of Virginia, and to erect thereon suitable buildings at a total cost not exceeding \$300,000, of which not more than \$40,000 shall be expended for a site, and toward said purpose there is appropriated the sum of \$125,000 to be immediately available; if the land proposed to be acquired is within the District of Columbia, and the same can not be acquired by purchase at a price satisfactory to the commissioners, they are authorized to condemn the same under the provisions of chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia. If the land can not be acquired within the District of Columbia, the Attorney General of the United States, at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such land as may be selected for said site either in the State of Maryland or in the State of Virginia in accordance with the laws of said States, the title of said land to be taken directly to and in the name of the United States, but the land so acquired shall be under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as agents of the United States, and expenses of procuring evidence of title or of condemnation, or both, shall be paid out of the appropriation herein made for the purchase of said site."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON moves to recede and concur with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to acquire a site for a home and school for feeble-minded persons, said site to be located in the District of Columbia or in the State of Maryland or in the State of Virginia, and to erect thereon suitable buildings at a total cost not exceeding \$300,000, of which not more than \$38,000 shall be expended for a site, and toward said purpose there is reappropriated the sum of \$100,000 contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1923 toward the erection of suitable buildings for a home and school for feeble-minded persons, to be available immediately. If the land proposed to be acquired is within the District of Columbia, and the same can not be acquired by purchase at a price satisfactory to the commissioners, they are authorized to condemn the same under the provisions of chapter 15 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia. If the land proposed to be acquired is without the District of Columbia and can not be purchased at a satisfactory price, the Attorney General of the United States, at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such land as may be selected for said site either in the State of Maryland or in the State of Virginia in accordance with the laws of said States, the title of said land to be taken directly to and in the name of the United States, but the land so acquired shall be under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as agents of the United States, and expenses of procuring evidence of title or of condemnation, or both, shall be paid out of the appropriation herein made for the purchase of said site. The persons to be admissible to said home and school and the proceedings with reference to securing such admission to be in accordance with law. The authorization to use a site for a home and school for feeble-minded persons on lands owned by the District of Columbia, contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1923, is hereby repealed."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 116: Page 93, after line 19, insert:

"NATIONAL LIBRARY FOR THE BLIND.

"For aid and support of the National Library for the Blind, located at 1800 D Street N.W., to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$5,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the amount proposed in said amendment, insert "\$2,500."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, that restores the amount of the appropriation for the current year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. How long has the National Government been aiding in support of this library?

Mr. CRAMTON. For 10 years or more.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has been my understanding that the Library of Congress has special books for the use of the blind which are sent out to libraries throughout the country. I was not aware that there was a special library here for the blind having national support.

Mr. CRAMTON. This library was incorporated in 1911 and is supported by dues and gifts. It is engaged in circulating books to blind people throughout the United States, and it provides employment for certain blind people in preparing such books. They have the free use of the mails for circulating the books, under act of Congress passed in 1904.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is the first time that we have recognized an appropriation for this service.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, no; it has been carried for 10 years or more.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was not carried in the House bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. On several occasions it has been omitted in the House and has been restored in the Senate, and we are simply following tradition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was this stricken out on a point of order in the House?

Mr. CRAMTON. It was not recommended to the House by the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 117: On page 94, at the top of the page, insert:

"COLUMBIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE.

"To aid the Columbia Polytechnic Institute for the Blind, located at 1808 H Street N.W., to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$1,500."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 118: Page 97, at the top of the page, insert:

"The Board of Engineers constituted by Public Act No. 441, approved March 2, 1911, is hereby directed to submit through the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on or before the first day of the next regular session of Congress a report recommending such modifications in existing project for Anacostia Park above Benning Bridge as may now appear desirable and in the interest of economy."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 118 and concur in the same with the following amendment:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "The Board of Engineers constituted by Public Act No. 441, approved March 2, 1911, is hereby directed to submit through the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on the first day of the next regular session of Congress a report on the desirability or undesirability of continuing the said project above Benning Bridge, and if it is to be so continued what modifications in existing project above Benning Bridge appear desirable and in the interest of economy. Such report shall include such recommendations with a statement of the facts and shall include detailed estimates of cost under the modifications proposed compared with the estimates under present plans and the decrease in cost as a result of such modification."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 123, page 102 of the bill, after line 17, insert:

"For the construction of a comfort station and shelter at Haines Point, East Potomac Park, \$15,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 124: After the amendment just adopted on page 102 insert: "The appropriation of \$25,000 contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1923 for the construction of a bathing beach and bathhouse for the colored population of the city is continued and made available during the fiscal year 1924 for the construction and maintenance of said bathing beach and bathhouse at the Virginia end of the Key Bridge."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 124, with an amendment as follows:

"In line 7 of the matter inserted by said amendment before the word 'Key' insert 'Francis Scott.'"

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this proposed proposition, I think that the RECORD should show that considerable difficulty is being experienced by the authorities in finding a location for this bathing beach. The bathing beach for white people is in the Tidal Basin. The Secretary of War holds that if he had authority he would remove that, or if it were not already located there he would protest against its being placed there, because the water is not in a healthy enough condition to have it desirable for bathing. The authorities are having difficulty in finding a place for the colored people which will be healthy and still be satisfactory to those who are to use it.

There is a proposition to put it over here in the Anacostia River, a place where there is a gravel beach, but the authorities find the waters are so contaminated by the sewage as to make it unhealthful for bathing. There have been one or two other places suggested, but the only place that they have been able to recommend as desirable, reasonably accessible, with water in proper condition for such use, is at the end of the Key Bridge, as is proposed by this language. There have been many protests from colored persons against its being located in that section, so that it is by no means certain that the improvement covered by the appropriation here provided for will be made during the next year, but it seems the only tenable proposition pending.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I suggest to the gentleman that it would be very inadvisable to attempt even a tentative location at this time.

Mr. CRAMTON. The authorities have been investigating and considering it for one or two years. I talked with Colonel Sherrill about it this morning, and he feels that this is the only site which combines the desirable features of accessibility and healthfulness.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would like to say to the gentleman that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and myself had a very recent conference with the Secretary of War. We understood from him very definitely that nothing had been finally determined, and that the matter would be held for further consideration. We relied upon that understanding, and I am surprised to find the Senate provision that is carried in his report. I may say, in addition, that the facts within my possession show that the proposed location, for many reasons, is most undesirable, and I may say further that the newspapers of the city seem to indicate very clearly that the site is not acceptable to the people for whose use it is designed.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, it is my expectation that, unless it is definitely developed that the colored people for whose benefit this is being provided manifest a desire to have it constructed at this location, it will not be placed there; and therefore I have said I thought there was quite a possibility that the appropriation would not be used. I may say to the gentleman that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] was one of the conferees who signed this report.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I must assume the Senator's attention was not called to this matter.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think that is probably true.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And I therefore ask the gentleman in fairness—nothing can be lost by it—to modify his amendment so as to exclude the location specified. The Secretary of War, under the authority heretofore conferred, would then have the right to locate the bathing beach at such place as he might determine to be appropriate, and I urge the gentleman to modify his amendment to the extent I suggest.

Mr. CRAMTON. My amendment is only taken after a conference with the House conferees and the Senate conferees, and I would not feel it proper now to modify that language, as it is not my own entirely. But this was in the bill. No word has come to us from the Secretary of War of any such understanding, and I talked this morning with Colonel Sherrill without learning of such an understanding; but I understand that the construction of this beach will not be proceeded with by the authorities unless it becomes definite that the site is acceptable to the people for whom it is intended.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Well, assuming that, in view of the fact that one of the conferees is the Senator from Virginia, who, as the gentleman says, did not have his attention called to this matter, and that the situation is as I have tried to explain it—

Mr. CRAMTON. Do not quote me as saying—

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I thought the gentleman stated that.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; I said I thought it was possible.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Well, even so, I hope the gentleman will agree to accept a modification of his amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman realizes this language was inserted in the Senate and the Virginia Senators had every opportunity to know what the language was.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would ask the gentleman to consider a modification of his amendment by striking out the words "at the Virginia end of the Key Bridge," leaving the matter at large within the discretion of the Secretary of War, where it rests now.

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course the gentleman has the right to offer an amendment, but I have no authority to accept it.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I hope the House will adopt.

The SPEAKER. An amendment is not in order now.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield to allow me to offer an amendment?

The SPEAKER. The motion pending is to recede and concur with an amendment. If the gentleman will separate the motion to recede and concur—

Mr. CRAMTON. I am willing to do that.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment. Strike out the words "at the Virginia end of the Key Bridge," and I hope the House will agree to it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOORE of Virginia moves to amend the Senate amendment, page 103, after the word "bathhouse," by striking out the words "at the Virginia end of the Key Bridge."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I would not feel like accepting that amendment. This is a matter that was put in the bill several weeks ago, and in the conference where it was considered one of the Senators from Virginia was present. I talked this morning with Colonel Sherrill, and while he felt that he might not need it this year, would not be able to use it because of all this controversy, there was nothing about any agreement, and I fear the gentleman's amendment will simply complicate matters. I hope it will not be agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the adoption of my suggestion can result in any complication. According to the statements that have been made one of the conferees would be placed in a very embarrassing attitude if the amendment offered by my friend from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] is accepted; whereas, on the other hand, if the modification that I propose is approved there will not only be no serious complication but there will be no injury to any interest or individual, for the very simple reason that the entire matter will rest within the judgment of the Secretary of War, as it rests with him now and has rested with him heretofore.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not the real difficulty this, that there are some white folks over there in Virginia who are opposing this location? Where is there a location in the District of Columbia that is more healthful and more desirable as a site for a bathing beach?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. There is land on the other side of the river granted by the State of Virginia to the Govern-

ment of the United States. The location would either be on that land or on land that has been developed by the action of the river in the course of time. The question is not of interest alone to the people on the other side of the river. But it is general, and most serious so far as they are concerned. It is of interest to all people who oppose a bathing beach in the wrong place or operate it under improper and unhealthful conditions. There are people on both sides of the river who do not care to see the new bridge, which is one of the handsomest structures in the country, continually crowded with persons going to and from a bathing beach. There is opposition by those on both sides of the river who think it undesirable that a bathing beach should be in sight of those using the Key Bridge for ordinary purposes. Furthermore, according to the newspapers, there is pronounced opposition by many colored people in the District of Columbia who say they do not care to have a bathing beach located at that particular point.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. CRAMTON. How much time would the gentleman like?

Mr. BLANTON. Three minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas three minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there are liabilities that go with all assets, responsibilities with all benefits. The distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE], I believe, secures more bacon for his constituents than does any other Member of Congress. The great Potomac River separates his district from the city of Washington. Every fine, magnificent bridge that spans the Potomac River over which his favored people have easy access into the United States Capital has been built without one cent of expense to them, and maintained without one cent of expense to them, at Government cost. They do not have to be taxed to build bridges across the main stream that borders their country like people have to do in every other district. The gentleman here has exercised such a great influence over this House from time to time that he gets for them exactly what they want. He had this fine two and one-half million dollar Francis Scott Key Bridge built for his Virginia people who daily come into Washington so that they would not have to go two or three hundred yards farther to another bridge, which was not quite so convenient to them. This new bridge was constructed so that they would have a handy bridge right at their front door, as it were. They are not satisfied. Now, when the District of Columbia wants to use its own bridge in order to let its colored children who need bathing go to their bathing beach on the other side of the river, he does not want such clouds to obscure the fair skies of patrician Virginia. [Laughter.] Now, when Congress wants to give him and his Virginia people a present of a colored bathing beach he does not want to take it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield some time?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas must be facetious. Since I have been here I do not think there has been any original bridge legislation. It was before my advent here that Congress planned and authorized the construction of the Key Bridge. It is true that there have been additional appropriations made since I came here. The fact is that none of the water and land spanned by the Key Bridge is under the jurisdiction of the State of Virginia. That is true also with reference to the new railway bridge and with reference to the Highway Bridge, so that there is nothing in the point that the State of Virginia has not contributed anything to the construction of the Key Bridge. The matter now being considered is altogether aside from any such point. It is a question of large expediency. It relates to the wisdom of the action we should take. It relates to whether the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] shall be adopted in the terms in which it is framed or whether it shall be adopted by excluding any particular location. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the effect of the amendment would be to tie the Government to the selection of this specified place, instead of the Government having the right, as now, of establishing a bathing beach for colored people anywhere within the limits of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to vote with the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I am glad the gentleman will vote with me, and I hope the House will. I do not want to take the time of the gentleman from Michigan, and it will only be reiterating to say what I have already said heretofore, that no harm can be done by the modification of his amendment, while there will be a great deal of harm done and embarrassment created by adopting his amendment as it is written.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the original appropriation act for 1923, was the language in that appropriation "at the Virginia end of the Key Bridge?"

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. No.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Was it a general authorization, without any particular designation?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. So that now for the first time in this act it has been located?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I will say only this: The situation is that Colonel Sherrill tells me he has investigated this question and that the only available site suitable for this beach is the one specified in the bill. The gentleman from Virginia states that the Secretary of War, if he has the power, will not locate it at the point specified in the bill. So if you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia you are making an idle appropriation because the Secretary of War will not put it at the one place which Colonel Sherrill says is the only available place. I hope therefore that the appropriation carried for the next year will specify it is to be put in the only place that is available.

Mr. EVANS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Is it not true that in the original appropriation the hearings show that it was intended to put the beach on that side of the river at the end of the other bridge?

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman's information goes further than mine.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman from Virginia whether this was the first time that this location was ever made, and if the original authorization was general, and he said yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. It was general, but this language was inserted in the Senate this year.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The Senate concluded that it was desirable to locate it at this place?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. And if the location was not specified in the bill, it still could be located here?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; but the gentleman from Virginia says that the Secretary of War would not put it there.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE of Virginia), there were 37 ayes and 44 noes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia demands tellers. All those in favor of tellers rise. [After counting.] Twenty-four Members have arisen, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If it should be ascertained that a quorum is not present, will it be in order to ask for tellers on the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia?

The SPEAKER. No; that is passed, and the Chair was putting the other motion.

Mr. WINGO. I thought the Speaker had put the question and counted the ayes, and the noes had not been counted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was putting the question as to the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WINGO. We were in the midst of a vote on that?

The SPEAKER. There has been no vote. There has been no division.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The House having receded on its disagreement, will it be in order to vote down the concurrence?

The SPEAKER. Of course. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE of Virginia) there were 73 ayes and 35 noes.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 103, line 19, insert the following:

"Provided, That the following areas and parcels described and delineated on map No. 2, contained in House Document No. 1114, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, as a part of total area to be acquired for

said parkway shall be excluded from the total area finally to be acquired, to wit: Three hundred and fifteen square feet of lot 801 in square 2541, 349 square feet of lot 836, 1,303 square feet of lot 74 in square 2543, 549 square feet of lot 58, 2,106 square feet of lot 800 in square 1262, 3,600 square feet of lot 20 in square 23, 199 square feet of lot 80 in square 1238, and 50 square feet of lot 3 in square No. 1: *Provided further*, That the following-described lots and parcels that are without the taking line shall be included in the area finally to be acquired, namely, 4,483 square feet of lot No. 1, 2,919 square feet of lot 2, 3,259 square feet of lot 3 in square 2510, 6,879 square feet of lot 1 in square 47, and about 902 square feet of lot 803 in square 2543: *Provided further*, That in order to protect Rock Creek and its tributaries, none of the moneys herein or heretofore appropriated for the opening, widening, or extending of any street, avenue, or highway in the District of Columbia shall be extended for the opening, widening, or extension of any street, avenue, or highway which shall or may in the judgment of the District Commissioners permanently injure or diminish the existing flow of Rock Creek or any of its tributaries, nor shall permission so to do at private expense be granted to any private person or corporation except by the joint consent and approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMTON moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment 126 with an amendment, as follows: In line 28 of the Senate amendment strike out the word "extended" and insert "expended."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment restores the language originally reported to the House and the amendment I am proposing to the Senate amendment No. 126 is to correct a typographical error.

Mr. DALLINGER. What is the object of this language in the Senate amendment?

Mr. CRAMTON. This was with reference to the Rock Creek-Potomac Park Driveway, which has boundaries that have been authorized heretofore, and this language is to modify those boundaries as in their actual survey and work they have found is to be desirable; in some places to take out little pieces of land that it is not desirable to have within the parkway and in others to add to the parkway similar small portions of land now outside.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 126 and concur in the same with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 127: Page 105, after line 4, insert:

"The authority of the commission is hereby extended to acquire, by purchase or condemnation or otherwise, the following additional tracts of land for park purposes, to wit: The tract known as the Klinge Valley Park, containing about 8 acres, as shown on map filed in the office of the executive officer of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission and designated as the map of Klinge Valley Park, dated January 12, 1923; the Piney Branch Valley Park, containing about 6 acres, as shown on map filed in the office of the executive officer of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission and designated as the map of Piney Branch Valley Park, dated January 12, 1923; and a portion of the tract known as the Patterson tract, being parcel 129/2, except the portion of the west side of said tract, indicated as eliminated from said tract by a map filed in the office of the executive officer of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission and designated as map of the Patterson tract, dated January 12, 1923, containing about 70 acres. The commission is further authorized to reduce the area to be acquired in either of said tracts, where, by reason of improvements constructed or unreasonable prices asked, or for other reasons in their judgment the public interest may require, and the limit hereinafter fixed to be paid for said tracts shall be reduced accordingly: *Provided*, That if acquired by purchase the cost of the respective tracts shall not exceed the following sums: The Klinge Valley Park, \$155,950; the Piney Branch Valley Park, \$94,050; and that portion of the Patterson tract above designated, \$425,000, and there is hereby authorized and appropriated for the purposes specified herein the sum of \$675,000: *Provided further*, That the tracts authorized to be acquired by this act shall become part of the park system of the District of Columbia and be under control of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army: *Provided further*, That Cleveland Avenue from Thirty-fourth Street eastward to Thirty-third Place is hereby declared closed and the title thereto receded to the owner of the abutting property by whom it was dedicated, in consideration of the dedication by the same owner of a larger area for the widening and extension of Thirty-third Place, as shown by the map of Klinge Valley Park herein referred to."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 127.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. DALLINGER. I would like to ask why these parcels should not be taken. As I understand it, they are tributaries of Rock Creek, and if they are closed up and filled in it will seriously affect the amount of water in Rock Creek, which is already small. It would seem to anyone coming here from another State that in any other city in the country those two branches of Rock Creek would be taken as a natural part of the park system, and I have always wondered why they were not originally taken.

Mr. CRAMTON. There are three parcels called for, one the Patterson tract, which was not in the Budget and has nothing

whatever to do with the situation the gentleman speaks of, because it is in another part of the city; the Klinge Valley and Piney Branch portions are both tributaries of Rock Creek and have been urged that they would be desirable additions to the park. I have not heard it urged that these had any material bearing upon the water situation the gentleman speaks of. My own impression is that the reason that this land has not been acquired is that Congress has always felt that the owners of the land were trying to make a bonanza out of the Government by having the Government take it over at an unfair price. The lands are not good for anything else than park purposes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I would state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there has been a concerted effort for the last four years upon the part of owners of these tracts of land to unload them on the Government of the United States at this big price. They do not affect the waterway. That matter has been looked into carefully by men who are just as much interested in the District of Columbia and the city of Washington as any other person. I do not believe the gentleman from Massachusetts, if he understood the inside of it, would permit these owners to unload this property on the Government at this big price.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. I would like to make a statement in answer to the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts. One of these tracts crosses Sixteenth Street at the bridge, with which we are all familiar, and the park as owned by the Government runs to the bridge. Immediately east of Sixteenth Street there is an avenue running from the north end of the bridge in a northeasterly direction, which runs in the direction in which those who wish to purchase this land for park purposes wish to have the parkway run, and there can be on the south side of this little valley at the south end of the bridge and from the park up to the south end of the bridge a roadway that is better than you can build on the east side of the bridge where it is proposed to develop a roadway. There is a flood-water sewer now constructed, the end of which is immediately west of Sixteenth Street Bridge, which carries all of the water, except that which falls on the small tract in question, down into the park. The other tract of land is over under Connecticut Avenue. There is now a roadway 50 feet wide, belonging to the Government, one of the proper highways of the District, and the proposed purchase of that land is simply to extend that highway 200 feet wide and put upon the Government the burden of fixing up nicely a property for a rich proprietor. That is its only advantage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 129: Page 108, line 10, after the figures "\$1,500,000" insert: "Provided, That the Secretary of War may enter into contracts for materials and work necessary to the construction of said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made, not to exceed in the aggregate the sum of \$6,150,000, including all appropriations and contract authorizations herein and heretofore made: *Provided further*, That no bid in excess of the estimated cost for that portion of the work or plant covered by the bid shall be accepted, nor shall any contract for any portion of the work, material, or equipment to constitute a part of the plant for which this appropriation is available be valid unless the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army shall have certified thereon that all its terms are within the requirements of the authorization and the revised estimates for the work: *Provided further*, That whenever the Secretary of War causes proceedings to be instituted for the acquisition by condemnation of any lands or interests therein needed for the said work, the United States, upon the filing of the petition in any such proceedings, shall have the right to take immediate possession of said lands, easements, rights of way, or otherwise, to the extent of the interest to be acquired, and to proceed with the work herein authorized: *Provided further*, That certain adequate provisions shall have been made for the payment of just compensation to the party or parties entitled thereto, either by previous appropriation by the United States or by the deposit of moneys or other form of security in such amount and form as shall be approved by the court in which such proceedings shall be instituted. The respondent or respondents may move at any time in the court to increase or change the amounts or securities and the court shall make such order as shall be just in the premises and as shall adequately protect the respondents. In every case the proceedings in condemnation shall be diligently prosecuted on the part of the United States in order that such compensation may be promptly ascertained and paid: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall submit to Congress on the first day of the next and each succeeding regular session of Congress, until the entire project shall have been completed, a report on said water system and increase of water supply showing, among other things, the progress of the work, construction under way and proposed within the District, connections with the present system of distribution, and revised estimates of cost."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 129 and concur in the same with an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "within," insert the words "or without."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a statement made upon this very important project.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the language covered by the Senate amendment No. 129 is the language originally reported to the House from the Committee on Appropriations, which went out on a point of order in the House. It has been restored by the Senate, and the amendment which I suggest is with reference to the report which the Secretary of War is required to submit to Congress on the first day of the next session of Congress, showing, among other things, progress of the work, the construction under way and proposed within and without the District. The language as the Senate inserted it does not refer to the work without the District, and the amendment proposes that the report shall deal with the work without the District as well as within.

Mr. STAFFORD. When I rose I was under the impression that when this matter was under consideration in the House and was stricken out on the point of order I believed at that time that without it the interests of the District would be jeopardized; that this safeguarded the interest of the District by placing certain limitations about this proposed project.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman from Nebraska, [Mr. EVANS], a member of the subcommittee last year and this year, as the gentleman from Wisconsin probably knows, gave a great deal of study and investigation to this subject of an addition to the Washington water supply, and in the subcommittee this year this language was prepared under the direction of Mr. EVANS. The subcommittee were very glad to follow his views with reference to this subject, because we knew that the interest of the Government and of the District would be fully safeguarded thereby.

Mr. STAFFORD. When is it proposed that this work of construction shall be completed, so that the District will have the benefit of this increased water supply?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will yield to the gentleman from Nebraska to answer that question.

Mr. EVANS. In answer to the question—

Mr. BRIGGS. Just a minute. I would like to ask in that connection the gentleman from Michigan to explain—

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, I will yield to the gentleman from Nebraska to answer the question.

Mr. BRIGGS. It is along the same line, and that is whether any actual work has been undertaken yet in connection with the construction of this new conduit?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I presume it is best for me to make a preliminary statement.

Mr. BRIGGS. I would like to hear that.

Mr. EVANS. There was originally by act of Congress a comprehensive investigation of the conditions which related to the water supply of the city of Washington connected with the probability of utilizing the power which is contained in the conditions that are presented at Great Falls. One of the various projects reported and the one which it was advised should be adopted was called, as I recall it, project E, and provided only for an increase of the water supply. The condition present is a conduit taking the water from Great Falls by a tunnel under the canal and then bringing it into this conduit which follows what is known as the Conduit Road to the reservoir known as the Dalecarlia Reservoir.

Mr. BRIGGS. In that connection, can the gentleman answer the other question as to whether new property is to be acquired by condemnation. Has not the Government enough property that it owns that it can utilize that right of way for this additional conduit instead of acquiring new property?

Mr. EVANS. I may say this, that the amount of property which is owned by the Government between the District line and Great Falls is nearly sufficient, but there are places where it will be necessary to acquire, either by purchase or condemnation, additional ground to carry out the improvement proposed and approved by Congress, which is the construction of another conduit of similar size from Great Falls to the Dalecarlia Reservoir. Then there is also a portion of the project which contemplates the distribution, in so far as it carries the water from the Dalecarlia Reservoir, to certain areas in the city, and we must acquire a right of way for putting in the various pipes or mains which will be necessary for that purpose. For this particular purpose it is necessary to have the right of condemnation.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has the gentleman any idea what the estimated cost would be for this new property which is to be acquired in this way?

Mr. EVANS. The gentleman can find that in the report which was made by the commission, and I think I have in my office a revised and detailed estimate which covers that proposition, but I do not have it at my tongue's end so as to give it to the gentleman.

Mr. BRIGGS. Could the gentleman incorporate that in his remarks?

Mr. EVANS. I will endeavor to do so if I have it, but in any event the gentleman will get it approximately correct from the proceedings of the commission and likewise in the first volume, I think, of the Chief of Engineers' Report for the Army for the year 1921; at least there is much valuable information in that report if the gentleman is interested.

Mr. BRIGGS. I thought for the RECORD the gentleman would not mind incorporating it.

Mr. EVANS. I shall incorporate the latest estimates I have for the project.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
ROOM 250, OLD LAND OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., November 18, 1922.

Subject: Supplemental report on increase of water supply, District of Columbia.
To: The Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

1. Act (Public) No. 256, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved June 29, 1922, contains the following:

"For increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia, in accordance with project E, submitted in Senate Document No. 403, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, the estimated cost of which has been revised and placed at \$8,738,000, there is hereby authorized an appropriation, including those heretofore made, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, of not to exceed the sum of \$8,738,000, which shall include the cost of all land, rights of way, easements, materials, engineering, labor, equipment, service, and all things necessary to complete said project and its full and complete connection with the present water plant of said District and its distribution system, and of said sum there is hereby appropriated for said purpose the sum of \$1,500,000, to be immediately available and to be expended in such a manner as will at the earliest possible date provide for the completion of said project. The Secretary of War may enter into contracts for materials and work necessary to the construction of said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made, not to exceed in the aggregate the sum of \$1,450,000 in addition to the amount herein appropriated. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to acquire all necessary land, easements, and rights of way necessary to the construction of said project by purchase or condemnation: *Provided*, That no bid in excess of the estimated cost for that portion of the work or plant covered by the bid shall be accepted, nor shall any contract for any portion of the work, material, or equipment to constitute a part of the plant for which this appropriation is available be valid unless the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army shall have certified thereon that all its terms are within the requirements of this authorization and the revised estimates: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall submit to Congress on the first day of the next regular session a supplemental report on said water system and increase of water supply, showing among other things new or proposed construction within said District, connections with the present system of distribution, and revised estimates of cost."

2. In compliance with the foregoing provisions of law contracts were made with the low bidder for the construction of so much of the new conduit from Great Falls to the Dalecarlia Reservoir, at the District line, as the funds appropriated and authorized would permit. These contracts, three in number, were approved July 28, 1922, by the Chief of Engineers, and provide for the construction of 45,700 linear feet of the conduit from a point 2,800 linear feet below Great Falls to the Dalecarlia Reservoir. Construction is simultaneously under way at a number of points on this new conduit. There remains to be contracted for the conduit from Great Falls to the point of beginning of the existing contracts 2,800 linear feet, mostly in tunnel, which work can not be done until land and rights of way are secured. There also remains, not covered by existing contracts, one-half of each cross-connection foundations and cross-connection superstructures.

The work not contracted for and which is required to complete the new conduit, and which must be done before additional water can be brought from Great Falls, it is estimated will cost as follows:

Gate chamber at Great Falls.....	\$80,000
Conduit, section No. 1.....	38,000
Tunnel at Great Falls.....	300,000
Cross-connection gatehouses.....	80,000
Land and rights of way.....	13,000
Total.....	511,000
Superintendence, inspection, and omissions.....	51,000
Total.....	562,000

3. This report is particularly directed to the provision of law quoted in paragraph 1 preceding, requiring a supplemental report on new or proposed construction within the District of Columbia, connections with the present system of distribution, and revised estimates of cost.

4. Since the enactment of the law quoted the question of purification and distribution of additional water has been very carefully studied.

The conclusion reached is that the general plan of filtration and distribution proposed in Senate Document No. 403, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, is sound and for the reasons stated in that report should be put under construction at the earliest possible date.

5. Works proposed: The works proposed and required are as follows: (a) A filtration plant complete, pumping station and power plant on Government-owned land near the District line.

(b) A distribution reservoir for the first high service, located on high ground about 1,200 feet northeast of the Georgetown Reservoir.

(c) A distribution reservoir for the second high service, located on high ground near Forty-fourth and Van Ness Streets NW.

(d) Pipe lines from the pumping station to the said new first and second high-service reservoirs and to the existing third high-service reservoir at Reno.

(e) A pipe line from the said new first high-service reservoir to connect with the existing first high-service mains at the existing gatehouse in the Georgetown Reservoir.

(f) A pipe line from the said new second high-service reservoir to connect with the existing second high-service main at the intersection of Seventeenth and Taylor Streets NW.

(g) New connection between the filtered water reservoir at the McMillan Park Filtration Plant and the existing gravity service mains to obtain 10 feet additional head on the gravity service.

(h) The installation of a chlorinating apparatus at the Georgetown Reservoir so that in case of emergency water may be supplied the gravity area directly from that reservoir.

(i) Repairs to existing works.

6. Filtration plant: This plant is located just west of the Conduit Road, near the District line, and will receive water by gravity from the Dalecarlia Reservoir. It is designed for an average capacity of 75,000,000 gallons per day. The location and general arrangement are shown on sheet No. 3. The plant consists essentially of an influent conduit to take water from the reservoir, a head house for controlling the operation of the plant with a tower in which is placed storage for chemicals and all mechanical equipment for applying them, covered mixing basins, open coagulating basins, 20 filters suitably housed, a covered filtered water reservoir, a pumping station and power plant for the development of power for the operation of the pumps, and dwellings for the operating force. The essential features of the plant are shown on sheets Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

7. First high-service distribution reservoir: A 15,000,000-gallon covered reservoir is located as shown on sheets Nos. 12 and 13, to supply the first high service by gravity. The reservoir will supply water to that service with a head of 220 feet instead of the present head on the service of 210 feet.

8. Second high-service distribution reservoir: A 15,000,000-gallon covered reservoir is located as shown on sheets Nos. 14 and 15, to supply the second high service with a head of 30 feet greater than that now furnished by the existing Brightwood Reservoir.

9. The pipe line to supply the first high-service reservoir is 48-inch cast-iron pipe laid along the Conduit Road as shown on the plans (sheet No. 1).

The pipe lines to supply the second high-service reservoir and the existing third high-service reservoir at Reno are 36-inch cast-iron pipes located as shown on the plans, sheet No. 1.

10. A 48-inch pipe line will connect the first high-service reservoir with the existing first high-service mains, and the details of the connections are shown on sheet No. 1.

11. The pipe line to connect the second high-service reservoir with the existing 36-inch second high-service main at Seventeenth and Taylor Streets NW, is 72-inch diameter concrete-lined tunnel from Forty-fourth Street NW, along the line of Upton Street for 3,300 feet, thence 42-inch cast-iron pipe, all as shown on sheet No. 1.

12. Desirability of obtaining additional head on gravity service: The head on gravity service is now about 146 feet above sea level. The desirability of a somewhat greater head has been obvious for many years, but the necessary work for accomplishing that purpose has been deferred until a general overhauling of the water-supply system was taken up.

An increase in pressure head on the gravity service of from 10 to 15 feet can be secured by laying a new pipe line to connect the filtered-water reservoir of the McMillan Park plant with the existing gravity mains, at a total cost of about \$100,000. No extra pumping would be required to supply the extra pressure, so that the cost of the pipe line would be the only expense incurred. As it would cost about \$12,000 per annum to produce the above extra pressure by pumping, it is evident that the cost of the pipe line will be a good investment.

13. Arrangement for emergency supply to gravity area from Georgetown Reservoir: Connections will be made for supplying unfiltered, chlorinated water to the gravity service in case a break occurs in the old tunnel or filtration plant, as shown on sheet No. 1. This water would be supplied through the existing 30 and 36 inch mains, making the conditions for the gravity service similar to those existing for many years before the filtration plant was built, with the very important exception that formerly the water was supplied in an entirely untreated state, whereas the future emergency supply would be clarified by the use of a coagulant and sterilized by the application of chlorine.

14. The normal operation of the entire water-supply system when the new works are put in operation will be as follows (see sheet No. 2):

Gravity-service area: The gravity-service area will be supplied from the existing filtration plant at McMillan Park "A" by gravity with a head of 156 feet. In case of any emergency which might interrupt service from this plant, water can be supplied from the Georgetown Reservoir "C" to this area with a head of 146 feet. This water would be chlorinated but not filtered.

First high-service area: The first high-service area will be supplied by gravity from the new first high-service reservoir "B," which will receive filtered water by pumping from the new filtration plant "D." In case of an interruption of this service, this area can be supplied by direct pumping from the existing pumping station "B," at First and Bryant Streets.

Second high-service area: The second high-service area will be supplied by gravity from the new second high-service reservoir "E," which will receive water by pumping from the new filtration plant "D." In case of interruption in this service, the area can be supplied by direct pumping from the existing pumping station "B," at First and Bryant Streets.

Third high-service area: The third high-service area will be supplied by gravity from the existing Reno Reservoir "C," as at present, but that reservoir will receive its water by pumping from the new filtration plant "D." In case of necessity, it can be supplied, however, as at present, from the old plant "A," through the First and Bryant Streets pumping station "B."

15. Repairs to existing works: The consumption of water is now so great that the existing works can not be put out of service long enough to permit repairs. As soon as the new conduit is completed the old conduit should be put out of commission and thorough and complete repairs should be made wherever they may be found to be necessary. With the new filtration plant and distribution system to the first, sec-

ond, third, and fourth high-service areas in commission, the demand for water on the tunnel under the city and the existing filtration plant will be reduced about 50 per cent. This condition will permit unwatering the tunnel and the making of repairs therein. Once the deterioration in the old works caused by their long service has been made good, they can be operated until the safe operating capacity of the combined old and new works has been reached.

The extent of repairs and estimated cost for such work are as follows:

Repairs to intake at Great Falls	\$10,000
Repairs to gatehouse at Great Falls	10,000
Lining unlined sections of tunnels	60,000
Repairing lining of conduit	30,000
Repairing lining by-conduit at Dalecarlia Reservoir	27,000
New gate in Dalecarlia sluice tower	2,000
New gate at wastewell No. 3	2,000
Repairing lining in tunnel	115,000
Three new air shafts in tunnel	11,000
New pumps and repairing machinery at Rock Creek station	21,000
New stack at Rock Creek station	2,000
New stack at Champlain Avenue pumping station	2,000
Repairing machinery at Champlain Avenue pumping station	4,000
New stack at East Shaft pumping station	2,000
Repairing machinery at East Shaft pumping station	4,000
Total	302,000

16. The locations shown on the drawings for the power station at the new filtration plant, the first and second high-service reservoirs, and pipe lines are the best from an engineering standpoint. Should undue difficulty or expense be encountered in acquiring the lands at any of these points, some modification of design of the corresponding structure to more economically fit such conditions may become desirable. The lands required for reservoir sites are so located that they are rapidly appreciating in value. They should, therefore, be acquired promptly. Some of the lands through which tunnel rights near Great Falls are required are in disputed ownership. It is evident that to await the results of efforts to settle questions of title or obtain title by condemnation will greatly delay the completion of the conduit, and similar delays may be experienced in acquiring sites for reservoirs and pipe lines. Congress, recognizing similar conditions as the cause of undue and expensive delays in the construction of urgently needed public works, has in the past enacted legislation which permitted construction to proceed while at the same time protecting the interests of the owners of property taken. The following is quoted from existing law:

Congress enacted the following (chap. 294, Supplement to the Rev. Stats., vol. 1) in providing for the construction of the extension to McMillan Park of the original Aqueduct:

"When the map and survey are completed the Attorney General shall proceed to ascertain the owners or claimants of the premises embraced in the survey, and shall cause to be published for the space of 30 days in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia a description of the entire tract or tracts of land embraced in the survey, with a notice that the same has been taken for the uses mentioned in this act, and notifying all claimants to any portion of said premises to file, within its period of publication, in the Department of Justice a description of the tract or parcel claimed, and a statement of its value as estimated by the claimant."

"Upon the publication of the notice as above directed the Secretary of War may take possession of the premises embraced in the survey and map and proceed with the construction herein authorized; and upon payment being made therefor, or, without payment, upon the expiration of the times above limited without the filing of a petition, an absolute title to the premises shall vest in the United States."

The river and harbor act of July 18, 1918 (40 Stats. 911), contained this provision:

"Sec. 5. That whenever the Secretary of War, in pursuance of authority conferred on him by law, causes proceedings to be instituted in the name of the United States for the acquirement by condemnation of any lands, easements, or rights of way needed for a work of river and harbor improvement duly authorized by Congress, the United States, upon the filing of the petition in any such proceedings, shall have the right to take immediate possession of said lands, easements, or rights of way, to the extent of the interest to be acquired, and proceed with such public works thereon as have been authorized by Congress: *Provided*, That certain and adequate provision shall have been made for the payment of just compensation to the party or parties entitled thereto, either by previous appropriation by the United States or by the deposit of moneys or other form of security in such amount and form as shall be approved by the court in which such proceedings shall be instituted. The respondent or respondents may move at any time in the court to increase or change the amounts or securities, and the court shall make such order as shall be just in the premises and as shall adequately protect the respondents. In every case the proceedings in condemnation shall be diligently prosecuted on the part of the United States in order that such compensation may be promptly ascertained and paid."

In the District of Columbia appropriation act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stats. 100):

"*Provided*, That whenever the Secretary of War, in pursuance of authority conferred on him by law, causes proceedings to be instituted for the acquirement by condemnation of any lands, easements, or rights of way needed for the said work, the United States, upon the filing of the petition in any such proceedings, shall have the right to take immediate possession of said lands, easements, or rights of way to the extent of the interest to be acquired and to proceed with such public works thereon as have been authorized by Congress: *Provided further*, That certain adequate provisions shall have been made for the payment of just compensation to the party or parties entitled thereto, either by previous appropriation by the United States or by the deposit of moneys or other form of security in such amount and form as shall be approved by the court in which such proceedings shall be instituted. The respondent or respondents may move at any time in the court to increase or change the amounts or securities, and the court shall make such order as shall be just in the premises and as shall adequately protect the respondents. In every case the proceedings in condemnation shall be diligently prosecuted on the part of the United States in order that such compensation may be promptly ascertained and paid."

In order that the completion of the new works may not be unduly delayed it is strongly recommended that there be enacted into law a provision permitting the Secretary of War to take possession of property required for the construction of such works upon the filing of a suit in condemnation.

17. Estimates of cost of works within the District of Columbia filtration plant:

Excavation, 112,000 cubic yards, at 70 cents	\$78,400
Roller embankment, 8,800 cubic yards, at 50 cents	4,400
Fill over filtered-water reservoir, 14,700 cubic yards, at 70 cents	10,300
Concrete, 32,000 cubic yards, at \$20	640,000
Steel for reinforcement, 2,378,000 pounds, at 6 cents	140,000
Acid-storage vault, tanks, and pumps, complete	16,000
Reaction tanks	18,000
Elevator	6,000
Bucket conveyor	8,000
Pulverizer, motors, blower, separator, complete	10,000
Belt, conveyors, and all weighing apparatus	8,000
Electric wiring and lighting	3,000
Heating plant, complete	16,000
20 rate controllers	50,000
Sluice gates	43,000
Gate valves	60,000
Meters	39,000
Chemical feed devices and gauges	28,000
Piping	65,000
Wash-water tanks and supports	31,000
Filter sand, 2,200 cubic yards, at \$3	6,600
Filter gravel, 1,700 cubic yards, at \$3	5,100
Head house, superstructure	226,000
Filter house, superstructure	175,000
Garage, shop, and storehouse	40,000
Office furniture	1,000
Laboratory equipment	1,000
1 tank truck for hauling acid	5,000
1 3-ton truck for hauling	3,000
1 house for superintendent	15,000
3 double houses for employees	45,000
Total	1,796,800
Superintendence and omissions, 10 per cent	179,700
Total	1,976,500

Power plant:	
Land, 2½ acres, at \$1,000	2,300
Superstructure of building	20,000
Substructure of building	34,000
Tailrace and tunnel	53,000
Surge tank	6,000
Penstock	64,000
Machinery	120,000
Total	299,300
Superintendence and omissions, 10 per cent	29,900
Total	329,200

Pumping station:	
Superstructure of building	83,000
Substructure of building	61,000
Motors and pumps, first high service	31,000
Motors and pumps, second high service	34,000
Motors and pumps, third high service	51,000
Motors and pumps, sand washer	9,000
Motors and pumps, priming	500
Transformers	23,000
Crane	4,000
Switchboard	20,000
Piping and valves	79,000
Total	395,500
Superintendence and omissions, 10 per cent	39,500
Total	435,000

Reservoir for first high service:	
Land, 220,000 square feet, at \$0.50	110,000
Excavation, 77,200 cubic yards, at \$0.70	54,000
Fill over reservoir and around walls, 35,800 cubic yards, at \$0.40	14,300
Concrete, 12,700 cubic yards, at \$20	254,000
Manholes, drains, gates, and valves	22,000
Total	454,300
Superintendence and omissions, 10 per cent	45,400
Total	499,700

Pipe line for first high service:	
13,540 linear feet of 48-inch pipe	431,300
Drains, gates, and valves	10,900
Total	442,200
Superintendence and omissions, 10 per cent	44,200
Total	486,400

Reservoir for second high service:	
Land, 310,000 square feet, at \$0.50	155,000
Excavation, 62,600 cubic yards, at \$0.70	43,800
Fill over reservoir and around walls, 23,200 cubic yards, at \$0.40	9,300
Concrete, 12,710 cubic yards, at \$20	254,200
Manholes, drains, gates, and valves	7,100
Total	469,400
Superintendence and omissions, 10 per cent	46,900
Total	516,300

Tunnel for second high service:	
Right of way, 800 linear feet, at \$1.....	\$800
Tunnel, 3,300 linear feet, at \$80.....	264,000
Total.....	264,800
Superintendence and omissions, 10 per cent.....	26,500
Total.....	291,300
Pipe line for second high service:	
Land, 132,000 square feet, at \$0.50.....	66,000
Grading, 16,400 cubic yards, at \$0.70.....	11,500
Pipe, 9,230 linear feet of 36-inch.....	172,200
Pipe, 10,610 linear feet of 42-inch.....	249,000
Drains, culverts, crossing at Rock Creek, gates, and valves.....	11,500
Total.....	510,200
Superintendence and omissions, 10 per cent.....	51,000
Total.....	561,200
Pipe line for third high service:	
Land, 80,630 square feet, at \$0.50.....	40,300
Grading, 12,100 cubic yards, at \$0.70.....	8,500
Pipe line, 11,200 linear feet.....	223,800
Culverts, drains, gates, and valves.....	11,300
Total.....	283,900
Superintendence and omissions, 10 per cent.....	28,400
Total.....	312,300
Pipe line between filtered-water reservoir of existing plant and gravity main.....	100,000

SUMMARY.

Work within the District of Columbia:	
Maps and plans.....	50,000
Filtration plant.....	1,976,500
Relocation of railroad tracks.....	14,100
Power plant.....	329,200
Pumping station.....	435,000
Reservoir for first high service.....	499,700
Pipe line for first high service.....	486,400
Reservoir for second high service.....	516,300
Tunnel for second high service.....	291,300
Pipe line for second high service.....	561,200
Pipe line for third high service.....	312,300
Pipe line from filtered-water reservoir of existing plant to gravity main.....	100,000
Total.....	5,572,000

18. Work outside of the District of Columbia:	
Gate chamber at Great Falls.....	80,000
Conduit, section No. 1.....	38,000
Tunnel at Great Falls.....	300,000
Cross-connection gatehouses.....	80,000
Land and right of way.....	13,000
Total.....	511,000
Superintendence, inspection, and omissions.....	51,000
Total.....	562,000

Work on new conduit now under contract.....		2,080,000
Superintendence and inspection.....	104,000	
Materials furnished by United States for work.....	40,000	
Maps and plans.....	60,000	
Temporary buildings.....	8,000	
Total.....	2,854,000	

19. Recapitulation:	
New work within the District of Columbia.....	5,572,000
New work outside the District of Columbia.....	2,854,000
Repairs to existing works within and outside the District of Columbia.....	302,000
Total.....	8,728,000

20. Detailed plans for all work proposed are in hand and construction can go forward as rapidly as funds that may be appropriated will permit.

M. C. TYER, District Engineer.

Fifteen inclosures, viz, blue prints and tracings:

- Sheet No. 1. General location plan.
- Sheet No. 2. Water service areas.
- Sheet No. 3. Filtration plant, general location plan.
- Sheet No. 4. Filtration plant, roof plan.
- Sheet No. 5. Filtration plant, elevations.
- Sheet No. 6. Filtration plant, ground-floor plan.
- Sheet No. 7. Filtration plant, mixing basins.
- Sheet No. 8. Filtration plant, coagulating basin.
- Sheet No. 9. Filtration plant, filtered-water reservoir.
- Sheet No. 10. Pumping station, arrangement of machinery.
- Sheet No. 11. Hydroelectric plant, arrangement of machinery.
- Sheet No. 12. First high reservoir.
- Sheet No. 13. First high reservoir.
- Sheet No. 14. Second high reservoir.
- Sheet No. 15. Second high reservoir.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has the gentleman answered the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin as to how long it will probably be?

Mr. EVANS. I am trying to come to that. The project also includes another filtration plant similar to the one that is now used for the purpose of purifying the water—settling it—a purification of it that will be placed at about the District line at a point near that of the Dalecarlia Reservoir. The two parts

of projects which require the greater length of time are the construction of this conduit and the filtration plant. It is stated that it can be completed in three years, and at the present rate of appropriation it will probably take about five years. I think now I have answered the questions which the two gentlemen put, unless there is something else—

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield further—
Mr. EVANS. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does this project in any wise include the taking of any rights of way of the Chesapeake & Potomac Canal which have become moribund and obsolete?

Mr. EVANS. My understanding is that it runs under the canal by a tunnel. Now, it is, of course, as the gentleman understands quite well, an easement, and there is a matter of value, and it will have to be settled by contract or condemnation; and that calls to mind the question, perhaps, which the gentleman really has in mind, which is that at the time the original conduit was constructed there was a dispute between certain landowners and the Government, and a certain amount of money under condemnation proceedings was appropriated but has never been accepted by the owners, although all rights of appeal have lapsed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask that the gentleman have two additional minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield the gentleman one minute. I have an agreement to get out of the way—

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want—

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstance, which is very important, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] It is clear there is no quorum present.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrew, Mass.	Fish	Klecza	Rodenberg
Ansorge	Frear	Knight	Rogers
Atkeson	Frothingham	Kreider	Rose
Bacharach	Funk	Kunz	Rosenbloom
Barkley	Gahn	Lampert	Rossdale
Beck	Gallivan	Langley	Rouse
Beedy	Garner	Layton	Rucker
Bell	Garrett, Tex.	Lazaro	Ryan
Benham	Gilbert	Leatherwood	Schall
Black	Glynn	Lee, N. Y.	Scott, Mich.
Blakeney	Goldsborough	Lehlbach	Sears
Bland, Ind.	Gould	Little	Shreve
Bowers	Graham, Pa.	Luce	Siegel
Brennan	Greene, Vt.	Luhring	Slemp
Britten	Griffin	McArthur	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Pa.	Hawes	McClintic	Snyder
Brown, Tenn.	Hayden	McCormick	Stephens
Bulwinkle	Hays	McFadden	Stiness
Burdick	Henry	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Stoll
Burke	Hickey	McLaughlin, Pa.	Strong, Pa.
Butler	Himes	Mansfield	Sullivan
Cable	Hoch	Mead	Sweet
Campbell, Kans.	Hogan	Michaelson	Tague
Cannon	Hooker	Mills	Taylor, Ark.
Cantrill	Huck	Morin	Taylor, N. J.
Carew	Hudspeth	Mudd	Thomas
Chandler, N. Y.	Hukriede	Nelson, J. M.	Thompson
Chandler, Okla.	Hull	Newton, Minn.	Tilson
Chindblom	Humphreys, Miss.	O'Brien	Timberlake
Clague	Hutchinson	Olpp	Treadway
Classon	Ireland	Overstreet	Upshaw
Clouse	Jacoway	Paige	Vestal
Codd	James	Park, Ga.	Voigt
Connolly, Pa.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Patterson, Mo.	Volk
Coughlin	Johnson, Wash.	Patterson, N. J.	Wason
Crisp	Jones, Pa.	Perkins	Watson
Crowther	Kahn	Perlman	Webster
Cullen	Kearns	Petersen	Wheeler
Curry	Keller	Pou	White, Kans.
Davis, Minn.	Kelley, Mich.	Radcliffe	Williams, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, Pa.	Rainey, Ala.	Winslow
Dominick	Kendall	Rainey, Ill.	Wise
Drane	Kennedy	Ransley	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Kincheloe	Reber	Wyant
Dyer	Kindred	Riddick	Yates
Edmonds	King	Riordan	Young
Fairfield	Kitchin	Robertson	Zihlman

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and thirty-eight Members are present. A quorum is present.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree with an amendment. The motion was agreed to.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW, 11 O'CLOCK A. M.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKERS PRO TEMPORE TO-MORROW.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will designate to act as Speaker pro tempore to-morrow in the memorial exercises for the late Senator WATSON of Georgia, his colleague, Mr. LEE of Georgia, and for the memorial exercises for the late Representative BRINSON, of North Carolina, Mr. STEDMAN, of North Carolina.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, for to-day, on account of illness;

To Mr. REED of New York, indefinitely, on account of death in the family; and

To Mr. ROGERS, for three days, on account of illness in his family.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its chief clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 10 and 25 to the bill (H. R. 13696) making appropriations for the Executive Office and for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 13793) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes disagreed by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and had appointed Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. HITCHCOCK, and Mr. HARRIS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 38.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2023) defining the crop failure in the production of wheat, rye, or oats by those who borrowed money from the Government of the United States for the purchase of wheat, rye, or oats for seed, and for other purposes, to correct an error therein.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13696. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up the conference report on the legislative bill. The Clerk will report it.

The conference report and accompanying statement were read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13926) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12,

13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, and agree to the same.

The committee on conference have not agreed upon amendments numbered 10, 25, and 26.

J. G. CANNON,
SYDNEY ANDERSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
REED SMOOT,
W. M. J. HARRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13926) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On Nos. 1 to 9 and 11 to 17, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for the officers and employees of the Senate in the numbers and amounts as proposed in the Senate amendments and makes the appropriation for the maintenance of the Vice President's automobile "immediately available."

On No. 18: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the statement of appropriations shall include the third and fourth sessions of the Sixty-seventh Congress.

On No. 19: Appropriates \$31,385, as proposed by the Senate, for special repairs to the Senate Chamber.

On No. 20: Appropriates \$55,370, as proposed by the Senate, for painting and renovating the Senate Office Building.

On No. 21: Appropriates \$16,180, as proposed by the Senate, for storeroom cages on the attic floor of the Senate Office Building.

On Nos. 22, 23, and 24, relating to the Library of Congress Building: Provides for the compensation of a clerk at \$2,250, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,000, as proposed by the House, and makes the compensation of two attendants in ladies' room \$720 each, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$480, as proposed by the House.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On No. 10: Relating to the appointment of clerks to Senators.

On No. 25: Providing for a disbursing clerk for the Government Printing Office.

On No. 26: Authorizing the employment of apprentices in the Government Printing Office in excess of 25 at any one time.

J. G. CANNON,
SYDNEY ANDERSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves the adoption of the conference report. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: On page 6, after line 12, insert: "Senators elected, whose term of office begins on the 4th day of March, and whose credentials in due form of law shall have been presented to the Senate, or filed with the Secretary thereof, are authorized to appoint the same number of clerical assistants, not to exceed four, at the same annual salaries, to which qualified Senators not chairmen of committees are entitled, whose compensation shall be paid out of the appropriation for clerical assistance to Senators."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. This amendment relates to the clerical force of the Senate.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, may we have this amendment reported?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has been reported. This amendment relates, I say, to the clerical force in the Senate. Under the present practice of the Senate a newly elected Senator gets as clerical assistance only the secretary provided by law. The effect of this amendment is to give to a newly elected and incoming Senator the same clerical force on March 4 that he would be entitled to on the 1st of December, at the beginning of the regular session. This amendment is obviously in accordance with the principle of equality between incoming and existing Senators, and we thought it would be proper to adopt it. I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25, page 24, line 23, after the semicolon, strike out the words "cashier and paymaster, \$2,500," and insert in lieu thereof "disbursing clerk, \$2,500: *Provided*, That the disbursing clerk of the Government Printing Office hereafter shall be charged with the receipt and disbursement of all moneys for said office in accordance with the provisions of the law relating to the Public Printer and other disbursing officers of the Government, under such bond and rules as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; and thereafter the Public Printer shall give a bond in the sum of \$25,000 for the faithful performance of his duties."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, under the existing law the Public Printer is the disbursing officer of the Government Printing Office. As such disbursing officer he has to give a bond of \$100,000. The Government Printing Office is the only department of the Government where the head of a department or of the service is also the disbursing officer. The existing situation is the occasion of a great deal of inconvenience on the part of the Public Printer, and in order to bring this part of the Government service into conformity with the situation in other departments of the Government this amendment provides that the existing cashier and paymaster shall be the disbursing officer and shall give such bond as may be required by the Secretary of the Treasury, and thereafter the Public Printer shall give a bond in the sum of \$25,000. I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 26: On page 35, line 18, after the figures "\$128,810" insert "The Public Printer may hereafter employ such number of apprentices as in his judgment will be consistent with the economical service of the office."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 26 with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "The Public Printer may hereafter employ such number of apprentices, not to exceed 200 at any one time, as will in his judgment be consistent with the economical service of the office."

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I make a preferential motion. I move, Mr. Speaker, to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Printing Committee of the House I am acting in accordance with the wishes and instructions of our committee in making this preferential motion. We believe that there is no necessity for limiting the number of apprentices to 200. The Joint Committee on Printing, as well as the House Committee on Printing, and, I might add, the Senate Committee on Printing, are unanimous on this point and favor concurring in the Senate amendment. In evidence of our belief that there is no necessity for the amendment limiting the apprentices to 200, I want to call the attention of the House to section 49 of the act of January 12, 1895, which is the general printing law:

The Public Printer may employ, at such rates of wages as he may deem for the interest of the Government and just to the persons employed, such proof readers, laborers, and other hands as may be necessary for the execution of the orders for public printing and binding authorized by law; but he shall not, at any time, employ in the office more hands than the absolute necessities of the public work may require.

I also want to call attention to the authority given the Joint Committee on Printing in the legislative appropriation act for 1920, approved March 1, 1919:

That the Joint Committee on Printing shall have power to adopt and employ such measures as, in its discretion, may be deemed necessary to remedy any neglect, delay, duplication, or waste in the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the existing law which I have quoted will take care of the matter of apprentices and there is no danger of too many being employed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIESS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The statement has been made to me that the expenditure for apprentices in the printing department of the Government was a useless expenditure because they were not needed; that the printing concerns all over the country were not employing apprentices in any great numbers, but they desired the Government to expend the money for apprentices so as to educate them in the trade, and as soon as they were educated they would take them away from the Government and employ them.

Mr. KIESS. I think that this statement is not correct. We are supposed to have the best printing establishment in the world, and I think it is only fair that the Government should train its proportionate share of apprentices.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. On the other hand, if the statement made to me is true, that apprentices are not generally employed in private establishments, but that they looked to the Government to make the expenditure it would be equally unfair for the Government to train them all.

Mr. KIESS. That is not true; and it has been proven that the training of apprentices is a good thing at the Government Printing Office. It has been unfortunate that under an act of Congress passed in 1895 the Public Printer has been limited to 25 apprentices in an establishment with over 4,000 employees. I am glad to say that the Public Printer has started in to train apprentices, and we now have the full limit of 25. The reason that the amendment was placed in the bill in the Senate was to give the Public Printer an opportunity to more economically carry on the business of the Government Printing Office.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIESS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman whether he will say that private concerns are employing in a considerable number apprentices in the printing business?

Mr. KIESS. I do know that private concerns are employing apprentices, perhaps not as many as in times past, but that will apply not only to the printing trade but other trades. Apprentices are not as plentiful as in years past. I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that in the hearings before the Committee on Printing we brought out the fact that there could be no reasonable objection to increasing the number of apprentices in the Government Printing Office.

Not only on account of the shortage of labor in various trades, but also to obtain employees properly trained in the special requirements of the Government service, is it highly essential that the Government Printing Office resume at this time the work of training many of its own skilled workers and continue without let or hindrance this most important duty to itself and to the printing industry of the United States.

On the recommendation of the Public Printer, the Civil Service Commission has agreed that any person entitled to preference because of military or naval service may be appointed an apprentice without regard to the 20-year maximum age limit. This will afford an opportunity for the rehabilitation training of many war veterans if the restriction to 25 apprentices now imposed by law is removed without further delay.

It is important, therefore, that the apprentice limitation be repealed by Congress at the present session, so that the Government Printing Office can begin at once more extensive training of veterans who may desire to earn a good and comfortable livelihood as thoroughly competent craftsmen.

As the Government Printing Office is unquestionably the best equipped and most suitable place in the United States for training in the various branches of the allied printing trades, it is regrettable that this wonderful opportunity is now denied by law to all but a few of the young men who so heroically offered their lives in defense of the Nation which maintains this big establishment. Their training can be carried on without the expenditure of a single additional dollar save for the compensation of the veterans who desire better to fit themselves for the continued service of their country. If for no other reason, the vocational training of disabled veterans alone will fully justify the extension of the apprenticeship system to meet their special needs.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the reason there are few apprentices in private business is because of a union rule that the unions enforce in these private businesses that prevents them from employing apprentices at will—the same influence that has

made Congress limit by law the number of apprentices to 25 in a four-year period in the Government Printing Office.

In every open shop in the United States to-day employing printers, without any exception at all—and by open shop I mean the kind of shop that employs a printer for what he can do regardless of whether he does or does not belong to a union—in every open shop at least 33½ per cent of the employees are apprentices. And the employers are not limited, restricted, or dictated to as to the number of apprentices they employ.

In all of what is called closed shops, where they will not permit you to employ any but union laborers, they have none—no apprentices or a very limited few. Will the gentleman tell us what is the average age of our 4,000 employees the Government now has down at the Government Printing Office?

Mr. KIESS. I could not tell.

Mr. BLANTON. I have understood that it is 42. I may be mistaken, but I have been told so.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important subject, and that we ought to have a quorum here. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ansorge	Fairchild	Kindred	Riddick
Bacharach	Fairfield	King	Riordan
Barkley	Faust	Kirkpatrick	Robertson
Beck	Fish	Kitchin	Rodenberg
Beedy	Focht	Klecza	Rogers
Bell	Foster	Knight	Rose
Benham	Frear	Kreider	Rosenblom
Black	Free	Kunz	Rossdale
Blakeney	Frothingham	Lampert	Rouse
Bland, Ind.	Funk	Langley	Rucker
Bowers	Gahn	Layton	Ryan
Brand	Gallivan	Leatherwood	Schall
Britten	Garner	Lee, Ga.	Scott, Mich.
Brooks, Pa.	Garrett, Tex.	Lee, N. Y.	Sears
Browne, Wis.	Gilbert	Leibach	Shreve
Bulwinkle	Glynn	Luce	Siegel
Burdick	Goldsborough	Luhring	Slemp
Burke	Gould	McClintic	Smith, Mich.
Burtness	Graham, Pa.	McFadden	Snyder
Burton	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Stephens
Butler	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Stiness
Byrnes, S. C.	Griest	McLaughlin, Pa.	Stoll
Cable	Griffin	McPherson	Strong, Pa.
Campbell, Kans.	Hawes	MacGregor	Sullivan
Cannon	Hayden	Martin	Summers, Tex.
Cantrill	Hays	Mead	Sweet
Carew	Henry	Michaelson	Tague
Chandler, N. Y.	Hickey	Mills	Taylor, Ark.
Chandler, Okla.	Hicks	Moore, Ill.	Taylor, Colo.
Chindblom	Himes	Morin	Taylor, N. J.
Clark, Fla.	Hoch	Mudd	Thomas
Classon	Hogan	Nelson, Me.	Thompson
Clouse	Hooker	Nelson, J. M.	Tilson
Cockran	Huck	Newton, Minn.	Timberlake
Codd	Hudspeth	O'Brien	Treadway
Cole, Iowa	Hukriede	Olpp	Upshaw
Cole, Ohio	Hutchinson	Overstreet	Vestal
Connolly, Pa.	Ireland	Paige	Voigt
Copley	Jacoway	Park, Ga.	Volk
Coughlin	James	Parks, Ark.	Volstead
Crago	Jefferis, Nebr.	Patterson, Mo.	Ward, N. C.
Crisp	Johnson, Ky.	Patterson, N. J.	Ward, N. Y.
Crowther	Johnson, Miss.	Perkins	Wason
Cullen	Johnson, S. Dak.	Perlman	Webster
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Wash.	Petersen	Wheeler
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Pa.	Porter	Winslow
Drane	Kahn	Pou	Wise
Dunbar	Keller	Radcliffe	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey, Ala.	Woodyard
Dupré	Kelly, Pa.	Rainey, Ill.	Wyant
Dyer	Kendall	Ramseyer	Yates
Echols	Kennedy	Ransley	Zihlman
Edmonds	Kincheloe	Reber	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and seventeen Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, resuming where I left off when the roll was called, I want to be fair upon this question. I understand, for instance, that the unions do allow a few apprentices. Take my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTERS], for instance. He has 103 union employees in his printing establishment, and he has four apprentices out of the 103 employees. Take the bricklayers in Chicago. They allow each Chicago contractor to have one apprentice a year. For instance, if the contractor is employing 50, or 500, or 1,000 bricklayers on one or many big jobs he can have one ap-

prentice a year and one only. The unions permit the Government to have 25 apprentices in the Printing Office in a four-year period. I have evidence in my office, given me in writing by employees in the Government Printing Office, that there are employees there now doing work that apprentices could do and receiving the pay of journeymen printers for doing it; and that no matter how capable and proficient such employees become, or how well qualified they are to do the work of journeymen printers, they can never be promoted to that position because union rules will not permit it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that I have not the time. If I had, I would be very glad to yield. Where we have 4,000 employees in the Government Printing Office, why should we not have as many apprentices as the Public Printer can use to the advantage of the Government? That is all this amendment provides. Let me quote it exactly:

The Public Printer may hereafter employ such number of apprentices as in his judgment will be consistent with the economical service of the office.

Why should the Public Printer not employ as many apprentices as he thinks is to the best interest of the Government? Why should he not be allowed to do that? The unions do not want him to do it. The law limits him to 25. Is there any reason that you can give to your judgment and conscience against that proposition? That is all the Government is trying to do here. Why limit it to 200? If among the 4,000 employees the Government can use 400 or 1,000 apprentices, why limit the number to 200? Oh, gentlemen, it is merely a union proposition. You can not get away from it. If limiting the number to only 200 had good sense in it, I would be for it. I am for union propositions when they are based on good sense, but when they are ridiculous I am against them. I am for many of the propositions that my good friend from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] stands for, and I tell you if they were all like him they would not be far wrong—

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Does the gentleman know how many printers they have in the Government Printing Office?

Mr. BLANTON. Four thousand employees there.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. For years they have had 25 apprentices, and the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] gives them 200. Does the gentleman not think that is a pretty good increase?

Mr. BLANTON. Why limit the number to 200? It is a union proposition. The Government should not have its hands tied.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. And does the gentleman not think that union men have the right to protect themselves or try to do so in a lawful way as far as they can do so?

Mr. BLANTON. Let me tell my good friend from Ohio that I am not in favor of unions protecting themselves by laws that benefit only their 4,000,000 union members to the detriment of the 107,000,000 people of the United States. I am for the whole people. There is not a man here who thinks more of him than I do—

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Oh, answer the question.

Mr. BLANTON. Why do that to benefit 4,000 men to the detriment of the interest of 107,000,000 people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the proposition that I am for. I am for the interest of the whole people as against the interest of a few.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following members failed to answer to their names:

Ansorge	Blakeney	Burdick	Cantrill
Bacharach	Bland, Ind.	Burke	Carew
Barkley	Bowers	Burtness	Chandler, N. Y.
Beck	Britten	Butler	Chandler, Okla.
Beedy	Brooks, Pa.	Cable	Chindblom
Bell	Browne, Wis.	Campbell, Kans.	Clark, Fla.
Black	Bulwinkle	Cannon	Classon

Clouse	Hickey	MacLafferty	Sears
Cockran	Hicks	Martin	Shreve
Codd	Hill	Mead	Siegel
Cole, Ohio	Himes	Michaelson,	Slemp
Connolly, Pa.	Hoch	Mills	Smith, Mich.
Copley	Hogan	Moore, Ill.	Smithwick
Coughlin	Hooker	Moore, Ind.	Snyder
Crago	Huck	Morin	Stafford
Crisp	Hukriede	Mudd	Stedman
Crowther	Hutchinson	Nelson, Me.	Steenerson
Cullen	Ireland	Nelson, John M.	Stiness
Davis, Minn.	Jacoway	Newton, Minn.	Stoll
Davis, Tenn.	Jefferis, Nebr.	O'Brien	Strong, Pa.
Dominick	Johnson, Ky.	Oldfield	Sullivan
Drane	Johnson, Miss.	Oliver	Sumners, Tex.
Dunn	Johnson, S. Dak.	Olpp	Sweet
Dupré	Johnson, Wash.	Overstreet	Tague
Dyer	Jones, Pa.	Paige	Taylor, Ark.
Echols	Kahn	Park, Ga.	Taylor, Colo.
Edmonds	Kearns	Parks, Ark.	Taylor, N. J.
Fairfield	Keller	Patterson, Mo.	Thomas
Faust	Kelley, Mich.	Patterson, N. J.	Thompson
Fish	Kelly, Pa.	Perkins	Thorpe
Fitzgerald	Kendall	Perlman	Tilson
Focht	Kennedy	Petersen	Treadway
Fordney	Kincheloe	Pou	Upshaw
Frear	Kindred	Radcliffe	Vinson
Free	King	Rainey, Ala.	Voik
Frothingham	Kirkpatrick	Rainey, Ill.	Ward, N. Y.
Funk	Kitchin	Ramseyer	Ward, N. C.
Gahn	Klecza	Ransley	Wason
Gallivan	Knight	Rayburn	Watson
Garner	Kreider	Reber	Weaver
Garrett, Tex.	Kunz	Reed, W. Va.	Wheeler
Gilbert	Langley	Riddick	Williams, Ill.
Glynn	Layton	Riordan	Williams, Tex.
Goldsborough	Lee, N. Y.	Robertson	Wilson
Gorman	Lehbach	Rodenberg	Winslow
Gould	Luce	Rogers	Wise
Graham, Pa.	Lubring	Rose	Wood, Ind.
Greene, Vt.	McClintic	Rosenbloom	Woodyard
Griffin	McFadden	Rosdale	Wyant
Haugen	McKenzie	Rouse	Yates
Hawes	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rucker	Zihlman
Hayden	McLaughlin, Pa.	Ryan	
Hays	McPherson	Schall	
Hersey	MacGregor	Scott, Mich.	

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not reported the roll call yet. Two hundred and nine Members have answered to the call, not a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 46, yeas 104. So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and fourteen members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, this amendment placed in this bill by the Senate merely gives the Public Printer the right to employ such number of apprentices as, in his judgment, will be consistent with the economical service of the office. The law regulating the Government Printing Office provides that he can not employ any more than necessary for the economical administration of his office in any department, and then the law gives the Joint Committee on Printing the right to supervise that proposition and require him to put on 15 or 30 or 40 or whatever they see fit. Now, the proposition of the conference committee is to concur with an amendment fixing it at 200, and it is simply an invitation to the Public Printer to appoint 200 and sweep away the power that the Joint Committee on Printing has to limit it to less than that. For instance, we have no idea the present Public Printer would do anything of the kind, but we do not know who will be the Public Printer five years from now, and he might come up and undertake to put 200 in there and the Joint Committee on Printing might say he does not need them. The Printing Committee says, "You can not put in over 50." His reply might come, "The Congress has given me authority to do that and I propose to do it," and that sweeps away all the right of the Committee on Printing to limit it. The whole proposition is just one of leaving it with the Joint Committee on Printing to determine whether he is employing them in a proper and economical way. Now, as to the question of employing apprentices in commercial establishments. The testimony of the Public

Printer is that in commercial establishments of the size of the Government Printing Office 200 apprentices would probably be employed, that would be about the per cent, and that is why this limitation of 200 has been put in this proposed amendment. The law as it stands here puts it in the hands and control of the Joint Committee on Printing—and that is not a very extravagant committee, if any of you have had any dealings with it—and the committee is a unit, both the Senate and House committee on the proposal that it ought to be left as the Senate put it.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. STEVENSON. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. It has been in a way said by the gentleman from Texas that this has been forced upon the committee by the labor union.

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not know anything about that. We have had no trouble with labor about it. This is a pure matter of business in a great business establishment of the Government, and we want the law left so that there can be no question about the fact that the Joint Committee on Printing can say to this man how many he can employ and if he has too many to tell him to go and get rid of them, if he can.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, the gentleman knows that the law limits the number to 25, and the effect of the amendment put in here cuts out the limit altogether.

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not know why the limit was put in; I am not responsible for it; but I do tell you this, that an apprentice gets 25 cents an hour and the journeyman printer, whose place the apprentice is supposed to take, gets 85 cents an hour, and it might be economical to have more apprentices or it might not be, according to the efficiency of the men.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I will.

Mr. MAPES. If the amendment proposed by the chairman of the subcommittee on the legislative bill limiting the number to 200 should be adopted, would the Committee on Printing then have authority to control the Public Printer within the 200 limit?

Mr. STEVENSON. This is a later law, and the proposition is that they give him the right to employ as many as 200, and he can say to the joint committee that Congress has amended the law and said that he could employ 200, which would sweep away the power to control him within the 200. That is the construction I put upon it. That is all I want to say about it, and the committee is a unit on both sides, and it is not in the interest of union labor or in the interest of nonunion labor, but it is in the interest of the economical administration of this great industry that we have reached this conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the whole question involved in the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the motion I have made is whether the Public Printer shall have unlimited authority to appoint as many apprentices as he deems proper, subject to the approval of the Committee on Printing, or whether the number of apprentices shall be limited to 200, as proposed by the amendment I have offered.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is evident that there is no quorum present.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves a call of the House.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves that the House do now adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, under the order previously made, until to-morrow, Sunday, February 11, 1923, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

973. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$1,154 required by the United States Coast Guard, Treasury

Department, for payment of damages caused by collisions with Coast Guard vessels (H. Doc. No. 563); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

974. A letter from the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Commissioner of Patents for the calendar year 1922; to the Committee on Patents.

975. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a list of leases granted by the Secretary of War during the calendar year 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Appropriations. H. J. Res. 440. A joint resolution to satisfy the award rendered against the United States by the Arbitral Tribunal established under the special agreement concluded June 30, 1921, between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Norway; without amendment (Rept. No. 1574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on District of Columbia. H. R. 4389. A bill to create a traffic court in and for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VESTAL: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 13809. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the settling of New Netherland, the Middle States, in 1624, by Wallons, French and Belgian Huguenots, under the Dutch West India Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 14270. A bill to amend sections 3, 4, 9, 12, 15, 21, 22, and 25 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13906. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn., or either of them, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River, in section 17, in township 28 north, range 23 west of the fourth principal meridian, in the State of Minnesota; without amendment (Rept. No. 1581). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14081. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Valley Transfer Railway Co., a corporation, to construct three bridges and approaches thereto across the junction of the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers, at points suitable to the interests of navigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1582). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. FULLER: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 14288. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; without amendment (Rept. No. 1575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 13004. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to lease to the Kansas Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, a certain tract of land in the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth; without amendment (Rept. No. 1579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. S. 1298. An act to carry out the findings of the Court Claims in the case of the Fore River Shipbuilding Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 14284) to provide the necessary organization of the customs service for an adequate administration and enforcement of the tariff act of 1922, and all other customs revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 14285) to limit the immigration into the United States of aliens ineligible to citizenship,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 14286) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of War to exchange the Long Point (N. C.) Lighthouse Reservation and a portion of the War Department reservation at Coinjock, N. C.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 14287) to authorize the Secretary of State to acquire in Paris a site with an erected building thereon, at a cost not to exceed \$300,000, for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 14288) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. HERRICK: A bill (H. R. 14289) prohibiting Members of the United States House of Representatives and Members of the United States Senate from accepting entertainment at the hands of an individual citizen or corporation, or from going upon pleasure trips, commonly called junkets, wherein the expense is borne by a private individual or corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 14290) to erect additional buildings to be used as rest camps for convalescents, beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Bureau; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALMON: A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) providing for printing additional copies of soil survey of Lauderdale County, Ala.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. COLTON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 441) creating a joint commission, to be known as the joint commission of gold and silver inquiry, which shall consist of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. KIESS: A resolution (H. Res. 519) to print as a House document the journal of the fifty-seventh national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic for the use of the House and the Senate; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A resolution (H. Res. 520) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay out of the contingent fund of the House to Chlide Nelms and Sherrill B. Osborne one month's salary as clerks to the late Hon. Henry Z. Osborne; to the Committee on Accounts.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota urging Congress to enact legislation guaranteeing to the wheat grower a minimum price of \$1.50 per bushel; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon favoring legislation which compels woolen manufacturers to label woolen fabrics by placing a tag on the product plainly stating the exact percentage of virgin wool; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts favoring an embargo being placed on coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana requesting Congress to enact such legislation as may be necessary to issue patents to farm units on Federal reclamation projects in order that such farm units may become taxable; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging Congress to submit a constitutional amendment prohibiting the further issuance of tax-exempt securities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, urging Congress to enact a law to guarantee \$1.50 per bushel to the growers of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, urging that Congress take cognizance of the present unfortunate condition of the wheat farmers of the Northwest and that a price of \$1.50 per bushel be set on wheat while this emergency lasts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 14291) providing for the examination and survey of North River, N. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 14292) granting a pension to S. F. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 14293) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 14294) for the relief of William J. McGee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A resolution (H. Res. 521) to pay Walter C. Neilson \$800 for extra and expert services to the Committee on Pensions; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 522) to pay Richard E. Roberts \$250 for extra and expert services to the Committee on Pensions; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7257. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the City Council of Worcester, Mass., condemning that group or organization known as the Ku-Klux Klan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7258. Also (by request), petition of McKinley Council, No. 50, Daughters of America, opposing any legislation removing the restrictions of the present immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7259. Also (by request), petition of New Mexico Wool Growers' Association, urging that the proper Government authorities perfect all necessary arrangements to permit owners of live stock in the United States to keep their stock in Mexico for a period of two years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7260. Also (by request), petition of representatives of commercial organizations of the United States assembled in Washington urging Congress to pass pending legislation relating to the American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7261. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of the Woman's Club of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bursum Indian bill, S. 3855; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

7262. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Citrus Chapter, No. 2, Daughters of American Veterans of the World War, regarding legislation for disabled tubercular veterans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7263. Also, petition of Massachusetts Department, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, favoring ample appropriations for the organization and training of reserve officers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7264. By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. James Carl and others, of Rock Island, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill 10427; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7265. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Community Councils of the City of New York, New York City, N. Y., recommending that the President take such action as will insure an uninterrupted supply of coal at a reasonable price to the public in the future; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7266. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of C. S. Longacre, general secretary of the Religious Liberty Association, Takoma Park, Washington, D. C., submitting the names of 356 citizens of Baltimore, protesting against Sunday bills pending in the House; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7267. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Earle C. Anthony (Inc.), of Los Angeles, Calif., indorsing and urging passage of the White radio bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7268. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to the Army and Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7269. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, opposing any amendment of the Constitution of the United States which shall disqualify either the Federal Government or any State or municipal government from issuing bonds free from both Federal and State taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7270. Also, petition signed by N. B. Hull and 20 other residents of Montague, Calif., asking the abolishment of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7271. Also, petition of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, of Chicago, Ill., relative to the question of the foreign debt of the United States and opposing cancellation of any of these debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7272. Also, petition of the Long Beach Dairy & Creamery, of Long Beach, Calif., indorsing and urging the passage of

Senate bill 4280; the De Laval Pacific Co., of San Francisco, Calif., indorsing and urging the passage of Senate bill 4280; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7273. Also, petition of the National Guard Association of the United States, Indianapolis, Ind., relative to the organization and equipment of the National Guard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7274. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of California, relative to the narcotic drug menace; the Department of Civics, California Club, of San Francisco, Calif., relative to the narcotic drug menace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7275. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of State Directorate, Massachusetts American Association for Recognition of the Irish Republic, favoring the 25-year plan with 4½ per cent interest passed by Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7276. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Greensburg Council, No. 82, Order of Independent Americans, opposing any increase of the 3 per cent quota in the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7277. By Mr. YATES: Resolution of Illinois Commandery, Naval and Military Order of the Spanish American War, favoring sufficient appropriations to put the Navy on the same basis as Great Britain's, for an Army of such size as shall insure the carrying out of the law of June 4, 1920, and preclude the possibility of the recurrence of conditions of the World War; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, February 11, 1923.

The House met at 11 a. m., and was called to order by Mr. Lee of Georgia as Speaker pro tempore.

The Rev. Page Milburn offered the following prayer:

Holy Father, Almighty, Eternal God, we the creatures of Thy hand, and the grateful recipients of Thy daily bounty, present our sincere acknowledgment of Thy mercy and protection.

Unworthy as we are of Thy gratuity and too often forgetful of our obligation to Thee, we beseech Thee to continue to bear us up in Thy hands and comfort us with Thy counsel. In prosperity restrain us; in sorrow and calamity comfort and calm us.

May the citizens of this Republic, and more particularly those identified with the making of its laws, be sensible of their obligation to remember Thy commandments to keep them, and to be filled with the spirit of the Son of Man who gave Himself to the uplifting of mankind, and was not unwilling to suffer death, to finish His chosen service.

May the grace of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ be with us all. Amen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the reading of the Journal of yesterday will be deferred. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will report the special order for the day.

THE LATE SENATOR THOMAS E. WATSON.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to House Resolution 471, Sunday, February 11, 1923, at 11 o'clock a. m., is set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of THOMAS E. WATSON, late a Senator from the State of Georgia.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution 523.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. THOMAS E. WATSON, late a Senator from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the House be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The question was taken, and the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that we all learned of the death of Senator THOMAS E. WATSON. The sad news was quickly carried over the wires all over the country, and the hearts of his thousands and multiplied thousands of friends and admirers, not only in Georgia, his native State,